

**ACADEMIC FEMINISM IN BRITAIN AND THE USA 1980 AND 1998:
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS**

by

RACHEL TORR

A thesis submitted to the University of Plymouth
in partial fulfilment for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

School of Sociology, Politics and Law
Faculty of Social Science and Business

MARCH 2005

University of Plymouth	
Item No	9006963233
Shelfmark	Thesis 305.42 TOR

Abstract

Rachel Torr

Academic Feminism in Britain and the USA 1980 and 1998:

A Comparative Analysis

Questions concerning the relationship between knowledge and other factors in the social world are among those that have been central to contemporary academic debates both within and outside of academic feminism. Linking into these debates, this study is guided by one central, underlying question: "What relationships exist between the changing perspectives, themes and contexts of academic feminism in Britain and the USA?" Four hypotheses form the framework for the project. These hypotheses are informed by recent debates within feminist theory that appear to emphasise the dominance of poststructuralism in 1990s feminism and literature addressing the social shaping of knowledge. By treating the hypotheses as ideal types, the study seeks to identify and examine changes in the themes and guiding perspectives of feminist academic work in Britain and the USA and changes in the broader material and cultural contexts where feminist scholarship occurs. Consequently, it aims to consider whether intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs. Textual analysis is employed to examine a sample of texts that were published in 1980 and 1998 and written or edited by academic feminists who were based either in Britain or the USA and existing studies addressing the historical contexts of academic feminism in Britain and the USA. The findings arising from the study do not confirm the intellectual shifts in dominance predicted. However, some trends in the expected direction are found and these are used to revise the starting hypotheses for future research. The findings confirm that intellectual shifts are related to changes in the broader material and cultural contexts in which they occur. The directions taken during the research are informed, primarily, by Karl Mannheim's work on the sociology of knowledge. Therefore, the study intends to demonstrate that Mannheim's view of knowledge and objectivity deserves revisiting and that his methodological approach is still relevant for guiding studies in the sociology of knowledge today.

Contents

List of Tables.....	1
List of Abbreviations.....	2
Acknowledgements.....	3
Author's Declaration.....	4
Introduction	5
Chapter One: Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge	15
1.1: Introduction	15
1.2: Situating Mannheim	18
1.21: Situating Mannheim Historically: When, Who and Where was Mannheim?	19
1.22: Situating Mannheim Intellectually: Intellectual Influences ..	26
1.3: Mannheim's Methodological Approach and Methods	41
1.31: Mannheim's Methodological Approach	43
1.32: Mannheim's Methods	46
1.4: Conclusion	48
Chapter Two: Methods	49
2.1: Introduction	49
2.2: Taking Account of Relationism: Increasing Objectivity by Incorporating Reflexivity	50
2.21: Critical Self-Awareness	51
2.22: Sensitivity to Heterogeneity	52
2.23: Desire for Comprehensiveness	54
2.24: Appreciation of the Dynamic Nature of Historical Knowledge	55
2.3: Sharpening the Focus: Topic, Hypotheses and Aims	55
2.4: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis: What is Academic Feminism?	58
2.5: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis: Academic Feminism 1980 and 1998	60
2.51: Textual Focus for the Second Stage	60
2.52: Preparing for and Drawing the Sample	63
2.521: Journals	64
2.522: Books	68
2.53: Immanent Analysis of the Journal and Book Sample	79
2.6: Stage Three - Sociological Analysis	83
2.7: Conclusion	86
Chapter Three: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis: What is Academic Feminism?	88
3.1: Introduction	88
3.2: Diverse Perspectives	90
3.21: The 'Big Four' - Liberal, Marxist, Radical and Socialist Feminism	93
3.22: Alongside, Within and Critiquing the 'Big Four' - Additional Perspectives	99
3.23: Poststructuralist and Materialist Feminism - Distinct Perspectives?	103
3.231: Poststructuralist Feminism	104
3.232: Materialist Feminism	108
3.3: Diverse Research Interests	118
3.4: Conclusion	124

Chapter Four: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:	
Britain and the USA 1980	125
4.1: Introduction	125
4.2: Hypotheses One, Two and Three	126
4.3: The 1980 British Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two	128
4.31: Descriptions	128
4.311: <i>Feminist Review</i>	129
4.312: <i>Women's Studies International Quarterly</i>	131
4.313: Books	134
4.32: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives	136
4.33: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts	139
4.4: The 1980 USA Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two	144
4.41: Descriptions	144
4.411: <i>Women's Studies International Quarterly</i>	144
4.412: <i>Feminist Studies</i>	147
4.413: <i>Signs</i>	150
4.414: Books	155
4.42: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives	157
4.43: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts	163
4.5: Summary of 1980 Immanent Analysis - Hypotheses One and Two	169
Chapter Five: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:	
Britain and the USA 1998	171
5.1: Introduction	171
5.2: The 1998 British Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two	171
5.21: Descriptions	171
5.211: <i>Feminist Review</i>	172
5.212: <i>Women's Studies International Forum</i>	173
5.213: Books	176
5.22: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives	179
5.23: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts	184
5.3: The 1998 USA Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two	191
5.31: Descriptions	191
5.311: <i>Women's Studies International Forum</i>	191
5.312: <i>Feminist Studies</i>	194
5.313: <i>Signs</i>	197
5.314: Books	201
5.32: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives	205
5.33: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts	213
5.4: Summary of 1980 and 1998 Immanent Analysis - Hypotheses One, Two and Three	220
Chapter Six: Stage Three - Sociological Analysis:	
Academic Feminism in Britain and the USA 1980 and 1998	226
6.1: Introduction	226
6.2: Post World War Two Contexts - Liberal Feminism in the USA and Radical Politics in Britain and the USA	230
6.3: The Women's Liberation Movement in the USA - Late 1960s and 1970s	238

6.4: The Women's Liberation Movement in Britain - Late 1960s and 1970s	245
6.5: Reflective Summary: 1980 Texts in Contexts	257
6.6: Reflection and Extension: 1998 Texts in Contexts	261
6.61: Greater Attention to Diversity	261
6.62: Greater Attention to Agency	265
6.7: Conclusion	274
Chapter Seven: Reflection and Conclusion	276
7.1: Introduction	276
7.2: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis: Identifying Perspectives as Ideal Types	278
7.3: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis: Identifying Intellectual Shifts	280
7.4: Stage Three - Sociological Analysis	296
7.5: Concluding Remarks	302
Appendices	305
Appendix I: Britain 1980 Sample Texts	305
Appendix II: USA 1980 Sample Texts	307
Appendix III: Britain 1998 Sample Texts	311
Appendix IV: USA 1998 Sample Texts	313
Appendix V: 1980 - Texts excluded from the sample due to the author or editor sex and/or location	317
Appendix VI: 1998 - Texts excluded from the sample due to the author or editor sex and/or location	319
Appendix VII: Frequencies and Percentages of Book Types in the Sampling Frame	323
Appendix VIII: Hypotheses	324
Appendix IX: Summary of Key Findings for Hypotheses One and Two ..	325
Appendix X: Hypotheses for guiding second stage analysis in future research that have been derived from the key findings that emerged during the exploration of Hypotheses One, Two and Three	328
References	330

List of Tables

Table I: Frequencies by first place of publication and book type	305
Table II: Percentages by first place of publication and book type	305
Table III: Summary of Key Findings for Hypothesis One.....	325
Table IV: Summary of Key Findings for Hypothesis Two - Part A.....	326
Table V: Summary of Key Findings for Hypothesis Two - Part B.....	327

List of Abbreviations

BL	British Library
BNB	British National Bibliography
LoC	Library of Congress
NCC	National Co-ordinating Committee
NLC	National Library of Canada
OPAC	Online Public Access Catalogue
UK	United Kingdom
USA	United States of America

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to the University of Plymouth for the funding that enabled this research to take place.

I owe an enormous debt to my Director of Studies and Second Supervisor, Professor Elizabeth Ettorre and Professor Malcolm Williams. Throughout the course of the project they provided me with valuable advice, gave me support and demonstrated their patience, even though, at times, I know I must have frustrated them. In particular, I enjoyed listening to their stories, which often made me laugh.

Many other people have given me encouragement and done their best to help me try to keep a sense of perspective. These include my postgraduate peers - now Drs Liz Hodgkinson, Julie Evans, Trazzer Collett and Suzanne Chamberlain - who enabled me to have fun along the way, which helped counter the stress. I thank my friends and colleagues in Marjon Student Services. Special thanks are due to Jenny Barnicoat and Julie Evans, who, despite their heavy workloads, managed to demonstrate their unflinching commitment the L.T.L. Club - I drew much support from its regular meetings in the final stages of the project. In addition, I am grateful to the College of St Mark & St John for allowing me time to finish the project when it was in its final stages.

I would like to acknowledge all of the people I have had the privilege of being taught by on both sides of the 'pond' during my undergraduate and postgraduate journey through Sociology and Women's Studies - all of them have had a lasting influence on me in some way. In particular, I thank Professor Mary Maynard for her time and advice before I embarked on the project.

Finally, I thank my family for their support and patience with me. In particular, I thank Sally Townsend who made sure I ate and rarely complained when I didn't listen. I also thank Leonard and Neli for making me smile.

Author's Declaration

At no time during the registration for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy has the author been registered for any other University award without prior agreement of the Graduate Committee.

This research was financed with the aid of a studentship from the University of Plymouth.

Relevant seminars and conferences were attended at which work was presented.

Presentation and Conferences Attended:

Torr, R (1999) "Contemporary Academic Feminism in the U.K. and the USA 1980-1998: developing a comparative analysis" roundtable presentation, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Chicago, USA 6th-10th August.
Torr, R (2000) "Contemporary Academic Feminism in Britain and North America: employing the insights of the sociology of knowledge" roundtable presentation, Knowing the Social World Conference, University of Salford, 5th-7th July.

British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of Glasgow, April, 1999.
Women's Studies Network (UK) Annual Conference, University of Warwick, July, 1999.
American Sociological Association Honors Program, Chicago, USA August, 1999.
Sociologists for Women in Society, Summer Meetings, Chicago, USA August, 1999.
British Sociological Association Annual Conference, University of York, April, 2000.

Word count of main body of thesis: 104,114

Signed: 

Date: 21/12/05

Introduction

...the sociology of knowledge seeks to obtain systematic comprehension of the relationship between social existence and thought.

(Mannheim, 1968:278)

In this research project I examine a sample of texts that were published in 1980 and 1998 and written or edited by academic feminists who were based either in Britain or the United States of America (USA). During the process of conducting the study I was guided by one central, underlying question, namely, "What relationships exist between the changing perspectives, themes and contexts of academic feminism in Britain and the USA?" The directions that I took in the course of my investigations were informed, primarily, by Karl Mannheim's work on the sociology of knowledge. As a consequence, one of the main intentions of this thesis is to demonstrate that his insights are still relevant for guiding studies that, "[seek] to obtain systematic comprehension of the relationship between social existence and thought" (Mannheim, 1968:278).

In order to introduce the study in a manner that resembles the spirit of the sociology of knowledge I will briefly describe my own motivations for embarking on it and provide some insights into how these motivations emerged. Consequently, it will become clear how these motivations link into wider, contemporary debates within academic feminism about intellectual shifts. Next, I will indicate why I selected Mannheim to guide my feminist research project and state the four aims of the project. After this, I will outline the four hypotheses that provide the framework for my exploration of academic feminism in Britain and the USA. Finally, I will provide an overview of the chapters that will follow this introduction.

This study was fuelled by a number of interconnected motivations that I regard as intellectual, personal and political. First, I am fascinated by epistemological debates about

the social situatedness of knowledge. Secondly, I gain inspiration from the potential consequences of a form of feminism that is, as bell hooks contends,

...not simply a struggle to end male chauvinism or a movement to ensure that women have equal rights with men. It is a commitment to eradicating the ideology of domination that permeates Western culture on various levels - sex, race, and class to name a few - and a commitment to reorganising...society so that the self-development of people can take precedence over imperialism, economic expansion and material desires.

(1981:194-5)

Thirdly, when I was developing my ideas for the focus of this project I had become concerned about certain critical claims. These claims appeared to suggest that academic feminism had become increasingly depoliticized and elitist (Ebert, 1996).

My fascination with the social situatedness of knowledge was nurtured initially by the way that I was introduced to sociological theory during an undergraduate exchange year in the USA in the mid-1990s. Here, rather than simply being delivered a set of ideas that were abstracted from their social origins, the ideas of a number of the 'founding fathers' were situated by a brief overview of the social backgrounds of and intellectual influences informing the men who developed them. This particular approach to teaching theory not only enhanced my understanding of the theories that these men had produced but also made their ideas come alive. It was a form of teaching that enabled me to see and reflect on the fact that the theories were developed and written down by real people who were writing for a purpose about a society that they were a part of and influenced by. Soon, I had moved onto more contemporary debates and my theoretical training became bifurcated. On the one hand, I was wrestling with postmodernism and struggling with debates about relativism within 'mainstream' sociological theory. On the other hand, I was beginning to develop an understanding of the multiple nature of feminism. Thus, marking an attempt to reunify my bifurcated interests, on my return to Britain, I embarked on an undergraduate dissertation that sought to critically examine feminist standpoint epistemology.

As a postgraduate student, I became increasingly frustrated by the way one particular feminist theorist had seduced me intellectually. This theorist was Judith Butler, whose work draws heavily on theories typically associated with poststructuralism, namely,

Lacanian psychoanalysis, Foucauldian discourse analysis and Derridean deconstructionism. From the perspective of the intellectual context that I was operating in when preparing for and conducting my masters dissertation, Butler's (1990, 1993) influence in the 1990s seemed to be quite phenomenal. By the mid-1990s she had been attributed titles such as, "the diva of avant-garde queer theory" (Hennessy, 1995:269) and, "the reigning 'Queen' of gender" (Rubin & Butler, 1994:97). Nevertheless, the fact that critics at the time appeared to single out the type of theoretical work commonly associated with Butler as proof of academic feminism's depoliticized and elitist status in the 1990s only added to my frustration. According to Ebert, by the mid-1990s,

...judic feminism: [which is] a feminism that is founded upon poststructuralist assumptions about linguistic play, difference and the priority of discourse and...substitutes a politics of representation for radical social transformation...ha[d] become dominant in the Euroamerican academy in the wake of poststructuralism.

(1996:3 emphasis in original)

Indeed, much of the literature that addressed the current state of feminist theory appeared to indicate that there had been a widespread shift in the dominant theoretical perspectives informing Anglo-American academic feminism during the 1980s and 1990s. This shift was often regarded as being, broadly, away from materialist perspectives to poststructuralist perspectives. For example, in what appears to be one of the most frequently cited texts in literature that addresses broad theoretical trends Barrett claims,

...the key thinkers of 'post-structuralism' - Derrida, Foucault and Lacan - have, in combination as well as individually, mounted a devastating critique of the main assumptions on which much social and feminist theory was previously based, and it has proved to be a critique from which neither has emerged unscathed.

(1992: 201).

She later states,

[i]t is, of course, quite easy to suggest that the influence of post-structuralism and the fundamental critique of Enlightenment rationality and classical Marxism, is establishing a new frame of reference that could be described as a shift of paradigmatic order.

(Barrett, 1992: 205).

With evidence of being influenced by Barrett's claims, Kemp and Squires contend that, "[f]eminist theoretical endeavour has increasingly challenged the dominance of materialist theoretical perspectives" (1997:7). They go on to say, "...Derridean deconstructive reading, Lacanian psychoanalysis, and Foucauldian discourses of power and corporeality,

for instance, have proved invaluable tools to feminist theorists across the disciplines" (1997:8). In addition, influenced by the general orientation of the book that Barrett's (1992) claims appeared in, Bradley suggests, "[a]s Barrett and Phillips (1992) imply, postmodernism and poststructuralism are becoming the new orthodoxies among feminist theorists of the 1990s" (1996:98).

Seemingly as a consequence of the theoretical shift, certain claims were being made about the content of feminist scholarship. Among these claims were those suggesting that the content of feminist scholarship was becoming increasingly concerned with cultural issues, such as, language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) ones. Here, for example, Barrett argues, "[i]n the past ten years we have seen an extensive 'turn to culture' in feminism...Within this general shift we can see a marked interest in analysing processes of symbolization and representation - the field of 'culture'" (1992: 204). Kemp and Squires (1997:7) also highlight this particular "marked interest". Likewise, describing current trends within academic feminism, Maynard states,

...the importance assigned by Lacan and Foucault to language and discourse has meant something of a re-focusing of women's studies interests away from the material aspects of women's lives (and a concern with such matters as economics, the labour market, the sexual division of labour) to an emphasis on symbolization, representation and textual analysis. In other words, changes in theoretical emphasis have increasingly led women's studies to focus less on social and more on cultural phenomena.

(1998:254)

As a critical response to this apparent shift, she goes on to say,

... the current theoretical hype about culture, discourse and representation...has huge implications for women's studies, for it ignores the ways in which material processes influence the cultural practices which are available to individuals. Our lived experience is mediated not just through discourse or text but also through material structures and relations.

(Maynard, 1998:255).

As an additional consequence of the shift in theoretical perspectives, Barrett also highlights an increase in, "attempts to develop a better understanding of subjectivity, the psyche and the self" (1992:204). Bearing similarities to Maynard's (1998) arguments about the consequences of the "hype about culture", she regards this shift in focus as marking a movement "away from a determinist model of 'social structure'" (1992:204). In

some accounts, this increased concern with 'the self' also seemed to be linked to claims explicitly suggesting that feminist scholarship might be becoming more individualist rather than collectivist. For example, Kemp and Squires highlight, "[a] shift from the overtly collectivist and political to the more individualist and philosophical" (1997:8) within academic feminism. Emphasising some of the concern that had arisen about the influence of poststructuralism, Bradley also notes that, "[t]here is...unease with the pluralistic and individualistic vision of society which often emerges from such approaches, and which can be seen as potentially undermining the feminist contention that women as a category are oppressed" (1996:98). Given my current concern with arguments relating to the depoliticized nature of academic feminism in the 1990s, I found these specific claims particularly worrying.

Because my intellectual world seemed to have become increasingly dominated by the work of one thinker who irritated me, I wanted to find a way of refocusing my attention in a manner that would force me to read more widely. The more general nature of the claims about intellectual shifts appeared to offer me a suitable pathway to achieve my aim.

When reflecting on certain claims that had been made within debates about the theoretical state of academic feminism, I was led to wonder about the extent to which the intellectual shifts they mentioned actually were generally apparent within academic feminism during the 1980s and 1990s. Thus, when formulating my ideas for this project the questions that I initially wanted to investigate were fourfold. First, "Had there been a widespread shift, broadly, materialist to poststructuralist, in the dominant theoretical perspectives informing academic feminism?" Secondly, "Had there been a shift from a focus on social and economic (i.e. material) issues to a focus on cultural issues, such as, language, representation, symbolisation and discourse?" Thirdly, "Had academic feminism become more individualist rather than collectivist?" Fourthly, "Are shifts in the content of academic feminism related to shifts in the dominant theoretical perspectives?" In addition to wanting to investigate these four initial questions, I became interested in wanting to reflect on whether intellectual shifts might be related to shifts that had occurred in the social, political

and economic contexts of their production. This particular interest stemmed from my earlier investigations of feminist epistemology and reading of Bauman's (1987, 1991, 1992) work on intellectuals. Both of these experiences had sensitised me to arguments related to the social shaping of knowledge.

Although I wanted to read widely, I realised that it would be necessary to set some general limits at the outset to allow for a meaningful analysis of intellectual shifts and the contexts in which they occurred. Taking account of the work that generally appeared to form the focus of descriptions about intellectual shifts - Anglo-American feminist theory - and the locations in which my intellectual training had taken place - Britain and the USA - I decided that the geographical boundaries for the project would be Britain and the USA. A more detailed description of how I went on to narrow the boundaries further by selecting a sample of texts that were published in 1980 and 1998 appears in Chapter Two.

From the background information that I have provided above, it is clear that my study is concerned with debates about intellectual shifts within academic feminism that were circulating when I was preparing to embark on my study. In addition, it is also evident that my awareness of the social situatedness of knowledge had been sharpened primarily, although not exclusively, by my examination of contemporary debates and contributions within feminist epistemology. Why, then, within the context of a feminist research project, did I become so fascinated and convinced by the contributions of a male philosopher/sociologist who had died over fifty years before my study began?

I had encountered Mannheim briefly when preparing for a final year undergraduate seminar on the philosophy of the social sciences. However, I was advised to look at Mannheim's work in more detail when I was discussing the prospect of embarking on this project over a year later. Eventually, I did decide to pay detailed attention to work on the sociology of knowledge by Mannheim. In addition, I considered work by scholars who had both endorsed and criticised Mannheim's intellectual endeavours. As I read, I was struck by the way Mannheim's view of knowledge appeared to anticipate contemporary debates

within feminist epistemology. Moreover, his view of objectivity, which neither denies the social situatedness of knowledge nor resigns itself to relativism, seemed to be more comprehensive than the particular views that are provided by the feminist epistemologists who I had come to favour (Harding, 1991, 1993; Longino, 1990, 1993). Importantly, I realised that he appeared to offer a methodological approach that would enable a systematic examination of the sociology of knowledge.

It was in light of my reading of Mannheim as well as my prior intellectual training that I arrived at the four aims of the project. These aims are:

- 1) To identify and examine changes in the themes and guiding perspectives of feminist academic work in Britain and the USA.
- 2) To identify and examine material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 3) To consider whether intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 4) To demonstrate that Mannheim's methodological approach is still relevant for guiding studies in the sociology of knowledge today.

In order to provide a clear framework that took account of my aims and the specific questions I wanted to investigate, four hypotheses were constructed to guide the project. Following Mannheim (1968), the intellectual shifts that are predicted within these hypotheses are treated as ideal types. As such, the hypotheses are intended to facilitate a general exploration that seeks to, "[ask] to what extent [academic feminists] actually did think in these terms, and in what measure, in individual cases, these ideal types were actually realised in their thinking" (Mannheim, 1968:277). Because the hypotheses are ideal types it is possible that the investigation might find that feminist academics, "of the period might not, in actuality, have thought that way at all" (Mannheim, 1968:276). As Mannheim suggests, "[o]f course, it is precisely in the process of detailed investigation that much that previously appeared to be certain becomes problematic" (1968:277). Nevertheless, as ideal types against which individual cases can be measured, the

hypotheses act as a methodological device to help, "produce the concrete picture of the course and direction of development which has actually taken place" (Mannheim, 1998:277). Thus, the hypotheses are:

- 1) A shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA during the 1980s and 1990s.
- 2) During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship has become increasingly:
 - a) concerned with cultural issues, such as language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) ones and
 - b) individualist rather than collectivist.
- 3) The shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to the shift in dominant theoretical perspectives informing feminist academic work.
- 4) Intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

Admittedly, in the existing literature, the broad term 'materialist' seems to be frequently used to delineate one side of the theoretical shift that appears in the first hypothesis. However, the apparent slipperiness of the meaning of the term materialist could potentially render the first hypothesis meaningless without some form of additional qualification. As I will demonstrate in Chapter Three, this problem arises because poststructuralist perspectives appear to have the label 'materialist' attributed to them in some accounts that address materialist perspectives. Therefore, in an attempt to avoid the confusion that could arise without some form of additional qualification, I have added the term 'historical' to the term materialist in Hypothesis One.

My decision to add the term 'historical' was reached by asking, "What type of materialism might be informing these materialist perspectives?", in other words, "What understanding of the term 'material' appears to be informing these perspectives?" In order to answer these questions I looked at the terms that inform Hypothesis Two. This second hypothesis

identifies the shifts that are suggested as being associated with the two perspectives that are named in Hypothesis One. In this second hypothesis there is a distinction between issues that are denoted as being material and those that are labelled cultural. Here, issues such as language, representation, symbolization and discourse are labelled as cultural issues. Consequently, this labelling seems to imply that these particular issues are not included among the issues that would be regarded as material by the materialist perspectives that are mentioned in Hypothesis One. Moreover, the understanding of the material in these materialist perspectives seems to also exclude the biological as it appears in the form of materialism that is known as ontological materialism. This second exclusion appears to be evident because the focus is on social and economic structures and relations. Therefore, it is these particular structures and relations that seem to form the material base, "on which culture and beliefs, as well as subjectivity and agency, rest" (Barrett, 1992:209). Consequently, the type of materialism that I believe best describes that which informs the materialist perspectives in Hypothesis One is historical materialism. As my more detailed exploration of materialist feminism in Chapter Three will demonstrate, historical materialism exists in Marxist and non-Marxist forms.

The chapters in this thesis follow the course that I took during the project and report on the results that I reached. To clarify the framework within which my study is set, I provide an insight into Mannheim's work on the sociology of knowledge in Chapter One. Here, I describe Mannheim's view of knowledge and objectivity and the three-stage methodological approach that he appears to advocate for studies in the sociology of knowledge. In Chapter Two, I describe how I attempted to remain sensitive to Mannheim's view of objectivity throughout the project and outline the methods that I employed when conducting each stage of his methodological approach. Marking the first stage of this approach, I attempt to provide an answer to the general question, "What is academic feminism?" in Chapter Three. To this end, in the first part of the chapter, I map out a number of the theoretical perspectives that have been identified as being in circulation within academic feminism and clarify the characteristics of the two perspectives that are central to the first hypothesis. From the preceding chapters it will be evident that

Mannheim's first stage of analysis only appears to require this mapping out of perspectives. However, in the second part of the chapter, I highlight a number of research areas that academic feminism addresses in order to furnish a deeper insight into its concrete concerns.

Chapters Four and Five sharpen the focus onto the sample texts for 1980 and 1998. In these chapters I examine the sample texts in relation to Hypotheses One, Two and Three and, in so doing, conduct the second stage of Mannheim's methodological approach. In Chapter Six, I turn my attention to the final stage of Mannheim's methodological approach. Here, I attempt to situate the broad trends that I identified during the second stage of the project in their wider material and cultural contexts and, consequently, reflect on Hypothesis Four. The analysis that I carry out during the third stage of this project aims to meet the requirements set by the hypotheses in terms of accounting for broad trends between the years that have been selected for the project. However, from my general discussion of Mannheim's work in Chapter One, it will be evident that I only address one of the two phases of analysis that Mannheim suggests is required during the final stage of his methodological approach. The second phase of Mannheim's third stage requires more detailed analysis of individual authors' and editors' backgrounds than time and space constraints would allow for within this particular project. Therefore, this second phase has been set aside for future research. Finally, in Chapter Seven, I draw to a close with some reflections on my methods, findings and experiences of using Mannheim as my guide and suggest some directions for future research.

Chapter One: Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge

The principal thesis of the sociology of knowledge is that there are modes of thought which cannot be adequately understood as long as their social origins are obscured.
(Mannheim, 1968:2)

1.1: Introduction

Questions concerning the relationship between knowledge and other factors in the social world are among those that have been central to contemporary academic debates. Here, the social locations of 'knowers' have been problematized in order to detect the extent to which certain knowledge claims bear the imprint of their authors and to consider the implications they might have for the status of academic knowledge (e.g. Alcoff & Potter, 1993; Lennon & Whitford, 1994). Within academic feminism, intellectual energy has been directed towards exposing male bias within academic knowledge, which is regarded as a key bias. In addition, more recently, academic feminists have paid increasing attention to biases that are claimed to result from many different forms of stratification, including, for example, 'race' and sexuality.

Feminist standpoint theory has been one of the major epistemological developments within contemporary academic feminism. Drawing on Marxism in particular, a number of standpoint theorists aimed to develop an epistemology that would take account of the social rootedness of all knowledge yet, by substituting women for class, also claim privilege for a feminist standpoint based on the social experiences of women (e.g. Harding, 1986, 1987a; Hartsock, 1983, 1985; Smith, 1988). However, problems have arisen for feminist standpoint theory due to increasing recognition of the facts that women do not form a homogenous group and that some men may be more oppressed than some women in certain situations. These particular problems are ones for which feminist standpoint theory seems to have had no answers (Halberg, 1989; Hawkesworth, 1989:546). Thus, feminist standpoint theory, although, in my view, quite rightly concerning

itself with questions about the relations between knowledge and other social factors seems, without serious revisions, epistemologically untenable and, therefore, ill-suited for guiding my research.

Yet I believe that a number of the problems evident within feminist standpoint theory could have been avoided at its outset if the work of one sociologist, namely, Karl Mannheim, had been given serious consideration.¹ Indeed, as I will demonstrate in this chapter, Mannheim's contributions to the sociology of knowledge are implicit in the revisions Harding (1991, 1993) introduced in an attempt to salvage her standpoint project. Additionally, I will contend that elements of Mannheim's arguments are evident, although not explicitly acknowledged, in recent developments within feminist empiricism (Longino, 1993).

However, despite their apparent relevance to and, perhaps, unconscious influence on contemporary debates about the relationships between knowledge and other social factors, it appears that a lack of explicit consideration of Mannheim's contributions has not been restricted to feminist epistemology or feminist theory in general.² Speaking about the discipline of sociology in general, Goldman suggests that, apart from references to Mannheim's work within the sociology of science, the relevance of Mannheim's work to contemporary academic debates in general has largely been ignored (1994:266-267). Nevertheless, Goldman (1994) argues that Mannheim's work deserves to be reconsidered and his arguments and insights brought to the centre of debates. Therefore, my decision to use Mannheim's work to guide my research is driven, first, by the belief that his work not only complements but is also more comprehensive than recent developments within

¹ Admittedly, Smith (1988:77) does mention Mannheim when developing her standpoint theory. However, she mentions him only to write against him, basing her argument on an interpretation of his work that claims he views intellectuals as "rising above the contending views" (1988). Therefore, she appears to regard this as an example of the type of dis-embodied objectivity that she is critical of. I will argue below that the view of objectivity she appears to attribute to Mannheim is not the type of objectivity that he advocates.

² I am not suggesting that no feminists have explicitly mentioned Mannheim - see footnote 1 and Hekman (1986), for example, includes a chapter on his work in her examination of the sociology of knowledge.

academic feminism and, secondly, the desire to assist in the general process of explicitly reviving Mannheim's arguments.

Thus, in this thesis I aim to remain faithful to the methodological approach that Karl Mannheim developed for studies in the sociology of knowledge. In this chapter, in order to provide a context that will enhance understanding of his methodological approach, I will conduct a general exploration of Mannheim's contributions to the sociology of knowledge. While taking account of the ways in which Mannheim's work has been criticised, I will provide examples of recent contributions that appear to bear similarities to his views and I will set out a clear justification for using Mannheim's ideas.

In order to situate and enhance understanding of Mannheim's work on the sociology of knowledge, I will provide a brief outline of its background and content. Here, in a fashion that appears to remain true to the spirit of this area of sociology, I will describe some of the key historical and intellectual influences that help to account for why Mannheim's ideas took the shape that they did. In so doing, I will introduce a number of the major themes and topics that Mannheim addressed. During the chapter, I will reflect on some of the ways in which aspects of Mannheim's work have been criticised and, possibly, in recent years, resurrected. By considering some of the recent feminist contributions to debates about the social situatedness of knowledge (Harding, 1991, 1993; Longino, 1993), I will demonstrate similarities between Mannheim's work and these contributions, which will, hopefully, add force to my decision to use Mannheim as the guiding theorist for my research. However, I contend that the breadth of Mannheim's ideas provides justification for using him as my principal guiding theorist for this thesis. Finally, the chapter will end with an outline of the methodological approach and methods that he laid down for studies in the sociology of knowledge.

1.2: Situating Mannheim

The sociology of knowledge seeks to overcome the 'talking past one another' of the various antagonists by taking as its explicit theme of investigation the uncovering of the sources of the partial disagreements which would never come to the attention of the disputants because of their preoccupation with the subject-matter that is the immediate issue of the debate.

(Mannheim, 1968:252)

Mannheim's sociology of knowledge seems to have been developed with the distinct intention that it would be a tool to be used for practical purposes in the social world. In short, Mannheim's reasons for exploring why people hold the thoughts and beliefs they do were not purely intellectual ones. Instead, his aim was to encourage people not only to reflect for themselves on the reasons why they hold their particular thoughts and beliefs but also to try to understand why others' thoughts and beliefs differ from their own. As a result, Mannheim hoped that people with different beliefs and opinions could enter into a situation where discussion that takes respectful account of all opinions could occur. It is in this sense that Mannheim intended his sociology of knowledge to be a practical tool for ending what he referred to as the 'talking past one another' which, in his view, was a problematic characteristic of his era.

For Mannheim, 'talking past one another' often occurs in heterogeneous societies when two or more people from different social locations enter into conversation about a particular 'object' or issue. Since participants in such a conversation come from different social locations Mannheim believes that they approach the 'object' or issue at hand from different perspectives and, therefore, from the outset interpret the 'object' or issue differently. Mannheim claims,

[f]or each of the participants the 'object' has a more or less different meaning because it grows out of the whole of their respective frames of reference, as a result of which the meaning of the object in the perspective of the other person remains, at least in part obscure.

(1968:251-252)

Yet Mannheim claims that rather than attempting to understand the source of the disagreement that often occurs during discussions between socially heterogeneous people and stems from the different ways such people approach the 'object' or issue at

hand, participants tend to keep their focus on the immediate issue under discussion. As a result, the participants end up 'talking past one another' because they do not understand one another's understanding of the immediate focus of the discussion (Mannheim, 1968:250-252).

In this section, therefore, I aim to provide some insights into why Mannheim thought that people in his particular age were troubled by the problem of 'talking past one another'. I will begin with a general description of Mannheim's social situation. In so doing, I will pave the way for the second part of the section where I will outline some of the major influences that provided him with the intellectual armament that he used to develop his sociology of knowledge.

1.21: Situating Mannheim Historically: When, Who and Where was Mannheim?

...it is a specific social situation which has impelled us to reflect about the social roots of knowledge...It is clear that such problems can become general only in an age in which disagreement is more conspicuous than agreement.

(Mannheim, 1968:5)

Mannheim was a Hungarian Jew born in Budapest in 1893. He was a student of the University of Budapest from 1912 until he gained a doctoral degree in philosophy in 1918. However, between 1912 and 1914 his studies also took him to Berlin, Heidelberg, Freiberg and Paris. In 1920 Mannheim migrated to Germany³. In Germany he continued his studies, took up his first, unsalaried, academic appointment in 1926 at the University of Heidelberg and then moved to the University of Frankfurt am Main in 1930 to become Professor of Sociology and Political Economy. Mannheim migrated again in 1933 and became a lecturer in sociology at the London School of Economics in England. A newly created chair at the Institute of Education in London enabled him to become Professor of Education in 1946 and to focus his teaching on the areas of the sociology and philosophy of education. Mannheim remained in London until his death in 1947. (Kettler et al., 1984:11; Remmling, 1975:xii-xiii, Simonds, 1978:2-7).

There seems to be general agreement that Mannheim's focus on the sociology of knowledge, which is seen as being central to his academic interests during his years in Germany, waned after his move to England (Kettler et al., 1984:80; Kecskemeti, 1952:1; Remmling, 1975:8; Simonds, 1978:6). Indeed, Remmling (1975:9) suggests that Mannheim's sociology went through four phases, each one having different major interests. During the first phase, 1918-1932, Mannheim's major interests are philosophy and the sociology of knowledge. The major interest during the second phase, 1933-1938, is the sociology of planning. Three major interests, the sociology of religion, the sociology of values and the sociology of education, are characteristic of the third phase, 1939-1944. Political sociology and the sociology of power are Mannheim's main interests during the fourth phase, 1945-1947.

However, like Simonds (1978:6), I would argue that the influence of the sociology of knowledge on Mannheim's thinking in later years was not entirely absent. For example, Mannheim's focus on the sociology of education, when in England, may seem more of a natural progression than a change of direction. This progression becomes clear if one takes note of the way Mannheim's earlier work in Germany stresses that education is a crucial element in the process of overcoming the disagreement and 'talking past one another' that he sought to account for in his work on the sociology of knowledge. For Mannheim, education about why socially heterogeneous people tend to think differently from one another - a question which Mannheim sought to account for in his sociology of knowledge - is crucial if people are to appreciate and gain awareness of the determinants on their own thought (Mannheim, 1968:138-9). Consequently, he argues that this particular type of education increases one's ability to choose between different views since, "...motives which previously dominated us become subject to our domination" (Mannheim, 1968:169). Therefore, Mannheim believes that education is the key to human freedom (Mannheim, 1968:169; Kecskemeti, 1952:27).

³ Kettler et al. (1984:11) seem to suggest Mannheim's move to Germany occurred in 1919 however the more detailed accounts of Remmling (1975: xii) and Simonds (1978:2) date the move later, in

Nevertheless, I agree with the general view noted above, namely, that the major essays that deal explicitly with the sociology of knowledge were written during Mannheim's period in Germany. Therefore, it is the period before his move to England in 1933 that I will now focus on more sharply. As a result, Mannheim's reasons for wanting to develop a sociology of knowledge with the practical goal of ending the disagreement and 'talking past one another' that he detected around him will begin to become clear. In addition, certain elements of Mannheim's thought, which I will use to illuminate the relevance of his social and political situation, will be introduced.

Focusing on the human sciences, Mannheim believes, "that nothing can become a problem intellectually if it has not become a problem of practical life beforehand" (1952a:135) and I believe that a greater understanding of his work can be gained by considering it in relation to his social world. It is important to stress here that Mannheim does not deny that many sociological phenomena are *based* on natural facts. However, Mannheim's focus is firmly set on the sociological and for this reason it is his social world that I will address. Indeed, when discussing the sociological phenomenon of generations Mannheim claims that this phenomenon,

...is ultimately based on the biological rhythm of birth and death. But to be *based* on a factor does not necessarily mean to be *deducible* from it, or to be implied in it. If a phenomenon is *based* on another, it could not exist without the latter; however, it possesses certain characteristics peculiar to itself, characteristics in no way borrowed from the basic phenomenon. The *sociological* problem of generations therefore begins at that point where the sociological relevance of these biological factors is discovered.

(Mannheim, 1952b:290-291 emphasis in original)

Thus, the questions I wish to examine here are twofold. First, 'what was it about Mannheim's social world that would lead him to claim that, "every form of historical and political thought is essentially conditioned by the life situation of the thinker and his [*sic*] groups" (Mannheim, 1968:111)?' Secondly, 'why did he believe that this type of conditioning of thought was a "problem" (Mannheim, 1968:5)?' The answers to these questions will become clear as I address them in relation to his experiences.

To clarify his view that knowledge is socially conditioned, Mannheim provides descriptions of situations in which such a view is likely to arise (1952c:198-229; 1968:5-11, 252-253). For example, Mannheim supplies an allegory about a young man who was born in a rural village community. He suggests that if such a person grew up in that community, was not exposed to outside views and never ventured out of his village he would be unlikely to reflect on why he held the thoughts and beliefs he had. Indeed, Mannheim argues it is likely that the rural man would just take his thought patterns for granted. However, Mannheim goes on to say that if the young man was to move out of his rural community and experience and gradually accept city life and the different views he encountered there it is possible that his original views would no longer be taken for granted (Mannheim, 1968:252-3). This allegory describes one of the conditions that Mannheim proposes is necessary for differences in thought to become evident, namely, *social mobility* (1968:6, 253).

Mannheim suggests that both horizontal and vertical mobility will help to raise one's awareness of the fact that one's own world view is not the only one in existence. He claims that horizontal mobility, for example, moving to a different city or country or job without changing social status or loosing ties with the traditions of one's original community or group, will expose one to people who think differently to oneself. However, unless ties to one's traditions are severed, Mannheim believes that one will only treat the different views encountered as, "curiosities, errors, ambiguities, or heresies" (1968:6). In light of this, he argues that rapid vertical mobility, mobility involving a rapid change in one's status group, "is the decisive factor in making persons uncertain and sceptical of their traditional view of the world" (Mannheim, 1968:6).

Mannheim does not believe that the social rootedness of knowledge is likely to be called into question or treated seriously at the social level in relatively stable societies, such as those where public interpretations of reality are based on a consensus of opinion or on the monopoly-position held by one particular group (1952c:198-203). In the former type of

stable society consensus is achieved through the, "spontaneous *co-operation* between individuals and groups" (Mannheim, 1952c:198) and, for Mannheim, is dominant within,

...socially homogeneous...societies, where the range and basis of experience is uniform, and where the fundamental incentives or impulses to thought tend to be the same for all individuals.
(1952c:199)

In contrast, heterogeneity between social groups may be present in the latter type of stable society. However, according to Mannheim, it is only the externally imposed monopoly-position that holds general public authority in this second type of society. As a result, only the monopoly-position is viewed as legitimate. Moreover, the social dominance that is legitimised by those holding and imposing the monopoly-position ensures that attempts by the lower strata to challenge it remain unsuccessful (Mannheim, 1968:7). For example, Mannheim argues that the church in the Middle Ages held such a monopoly-position (1952c:201, 1968:9). According to Mannheim, the combination of the medieval clergy's mastery of Latin, and their ability to read and write gave them, "...access to the source of Truth - the Bible and tradition" (1952c:201). Consequently, he views the medieval clergy as,

...organized as a caste and monopolizing the right to preach, teach, and interpret the world.
(Mannheim, 1968:9)

For Mannheim, it appears that there are two major ways in which the social rootedness of knowledge is likely to become apparent at the social level. The first is described as occurring when, "...the basis of existence of a whole group shifts in relation to its traditional norms and institutions" (Mannheim, 1968:253). The second, upon which Mannheim appears to place more emphasis, occurs when heterogeneous groups with modes of thinking that are viewed as holding equal amounts of public significance come into conflict within a society. Clarifying the second way, Mannheim argues that the presence of democracy or at least a democratising impulse is necessary for this particular type of conflict to occur (1968:7, 1952c:206, 1956:100). Indeed, Mannheim stresses,

[a]part from a considerable social ascent, it is not until we have a general democratization that the rise of the lower strata allows their thinking to acquire public significance...When the stage of democratization has been reached, the techniques of thinking and the ideas of the lower strata are for the first time in a position to confront the ideas of the dominant

strata on the same level of validity...It is with this clashing of modes of thought...that for the first time there is rendered possible the emergence of the question which is so fateful, but also so fundamental in the history of thought, namely, how is it possible that identical human thought-processes concerned with the same world produce divergent conceptions of that world.

(Mannheim, 1968:7-8)

Mannheim mentions three groups that began to experience an increase in the public validity of their modes of thinking in the modern era. These groups are the proletariat, which, for Mannheim, seems to refer to working class men, and the German youth and women. Mannheim suggests that a shift in traditional norms and institutions *and* a democratising impulse both fuelled these groups' growing awareness of their respective collective modes of thinking and the increasing public validity of the groups' modes of thought.

Although Mannheim suggests that the extent to which other factors were involved needs to be examined (1956:98), he contends that the societal shift in traditional norms and institutions resulting from the Industrial Revolution and the rise of industrial capitalism played a crucial role in allowing the proletariat, the German youth and women to gain consciousness of their respective group existence. For Mannheim, it was the shift in the basis of existence that occurred during the Industrial Revolution and the rise of industrial capitalism that allowed members of dominated groups to experience a collective workplace. The experience of a collective workplace was a completely different one from the relatively isolated existence that members of these groups had had before in their respective masters' homes. According to Mannheim, this new working environment enabled previously isolated individuals to become educated about and, therefore, aware of their respective collective existences. Consequently, on recognising the collective injustices they suffered in the existing order their commitment to the existing public interpretation of reality waned. Finally, with increasing democratization their different collective interpretations of reality were able to begin to gain enough public validity to become visible and to challenge the existing dominant public interpretation of reality (Mannheim, 1956:96-101).

From the brief outline of his life given above, it is clear that Mannheim had personal experience of horizontal mobility. Indeed, before and during the development of his sociology of knowledge he had experienced life in Hungary, France and in a number of cities in Germany. Therefore, it is likely that during his travels Mannheim had been exposed to different traditions and ways of thinking. Moreover, Mannheim's move to Germany in 1920 had been forced after the Hungarian counter-revolution of 1919-1920. As a Jew and an intellectual who was viewed as having links to the Communist party, although not actually a member of it, Mannheim was among those who feared being slaughtered by the White Terror in Hungary at this time (Remmling, 1975:17-18). Therefore, it seems possible to argue that Mannheim had also been subjected to vertical mobility. Thus, he had been exposed to the very conditions that he claims can lead one to question one's thought patterns.

I have argued that, due to his social experiences, Mannheim was no stranger to different world views. Moreover, his own forced exile to Germany provides an example that aids understanding of why Mannheim thought these differences were a problem for him as an individual. Yet as Remmling maintains,

Karl Mannheim - immersed in an empirical reality where the promise of progress and the assurance of order rode on sequential waves of terror - concluded that *all* ideas had been scandalized. This assumption informed the intellectual labor invested in his sociology of knowledge which took shape as the theoretical description and reflection of Weimar culture.

(1975:8, emphasis added)

It should not be forgotten that Mannheim lived through the widespread social instability and devastation that swept through Europe during the First World War and its aftermath. Thus, knowing that he lived through this particular era seems to enhance understanding of why he believed that the "clashing of modes of thought" (Mannheim, 1968:8) he experienced around him really was a social problem. How he attempted to explore and resolve the 'problem' is the issue that I will now address.

1.22 Situating Mannheim Intellectually: Intellectual Influences

There is nothing which has been said, which has not been said before...
(Mannheim, 1968:60 footnote1)

Contrary to the orthodox history of ideas, for example, Mannheim does not believe that the sociology of knowledge should aim to uncover the initial intellectual origins of particular ideas. Instead he argues that,

[t]he proper theme of [the sociology of knowledge] is to observe how and in what form intellectual life at a given historical moment is related to the existing social and political forces.

(Mannheim, 1968:60 footnote1)

I do not aim either here or in later chapters to search for the ultimate intellectual origins of ideas. However, it is useful to consider some of Mannheim's immediately recognisable intellectual influences, which, themselves, no doubt, have their origins elsewhere in the history of thought, because, in so doing, I will be able to introduce and describe a number of the key themes in Mannheim's work.

Just as many scholars of his time, Mannheim was familiar with the intellectual debates of the 1880s and 1890s known as the *Methodenstreit*. Indeed, Simonds claims that the work Mannheim is most well known for, *Ideology and Utopia*, first published in Germany in 1929, "can be taken as Mannheim's resolution of the central issues posed in the German *Methodenstreit*" (1978:106). These particular debates between German intellectuals centred on the problem of defining the correct method for studies in the social sciences. Here, arguments focused on whether the more positivist approaches used in the natural sciences were more appropriate for the social sciences than the older, more commonly used historical-interpretive methods (Kaiser, 1998:58). Mannheim rejected positivism in the social sciences as a "deluded school" (Mannheim, 1952a:150) and sided with those who championed historicism. Indeed, he claimed that,

Historicism is...neither a mere fad nor a fashion; it is not even an intellectual current, but the very basis on which we construct our observations of the socio-cultural reality.

(Mannheim, 1952d:84-85)

Mannheim was clearly influenced by the arguments of Dilthey who had made a distinction between *Erklärung* (explanation) as the aim of the natural sciences and *Verstehen* (understanding) as the aim of the social sciences (Kaiser, 1998:58-59). In contrast to the concepts and subject matter of natural science, which Mannheim had a tendency to regard more often than not as static⁴, Mannheim, in line with Dilthey's views, believed that the concepts and subject matter of the social sciences, concerned with 'lived experience', were dynamic. Kecskemeti (1952:4-5) states that according to this view, the self-repeating explanatory laws found in the natural sciences have no place in the social sciences. Instead, human acts, including knowledge, can only be understood in relation to the historical context in which they occurred (Kecskemeti, 1952:4-5).

In an attempt to shed light on his views about the context bound, dynamic nature of knowledge, Mannheim adopts a term from astrology, 'constellation' (1952a:134). For Mannheim, all aspects of social relations and life, including ideas, need to be thought of as forming a constellation. Simply stated, all aspects of social life are viewed as mutually interdependent and, when taken together, form part of a larger systematic totality, which is the constellation. In this respect, Mannheim argues that no aspect of a particular constellation - or, in other words, no aspect of a particular historical moment - can be understood if it is examined in isolation (1952a:143, 146). Thus, distancing himself from the specific meaning of the term 'constellation' in astrology, which he says, "no longer has any meaning or reality for us" (Mannheim, 1952a:134), Mannheim claims that,

[I]n a wider sense, the term 'constellation' may designate the specific combination of certain factors at a given moment, and this will call for observation when we have reason to assume that the simultaneous presence of various factors is responsible for the shape assumed by that one factor in which we are interested.

(1952a:134)

⁴ Mannheim's focus in the sociology of knowledge was on the human sciences and therefore my focus is on his views on the human sciences. He frequently does make a distinction between the type of knowledge in the 'exact' or natural sciences (eg $2+2=4$) and that produced by and under investigation in the human sciences. Yet his views about the extent to which the methods he advocates for the sociology of knowledge are also appropriate for the natural sciences are not clear cut and at times (e.g. Mannheim, 1968:243) he hints that in certain instances they may be appropriate in the natural sciences.

Merton (1968:552-556) is severely critical of Mannheim's apparent lack of clarity about the meaning of determination. Merton states,

Mannheim's analysis is limited...by his failure to specify the *type* or *mode* of relations between social structure and knowledge. This lacuna leads to vagueness and obscurity at the very heart of his central thesis concerning the 'existential *determination* of knowledge' (*Seinsverbundenheit des Wissens*).

(1968:552 emphasis in original)

However, if one attempts to grasp the concept of historically dynamic 'constellations' in Mannheim's work, his deliberate lack of clarity becomes understandable. For Mannheim, it seems that a major purpose of the sociology of knowledge is not to state once and for all, to borrow Merton's phrase, "the *type* or *mode* of relations between social structure and knowledge" (1968:552). On the contrary, in light of his view that knowledge forms part of historically *dynamic* constellations, Mannheim argues,

...of course it cannot be assumed *a priori* that the relative importance of the various social or other factors (economy, power, race, etc.), must always be the same

(1952b:313)

Consequently, for Mannheim, it seems that a major point of investigations in the sociology of knowledge is to examine the extent to which and the ways in which *particular* structural factors influence knowledge at *particular* points in time (1952b:313, 1968:239 footnote 1). This view, maybe somewhat ironically, seems not so different from the 'middle range' type of investigations that Merton (1967) advocates himself! At the same time it is important not to forget that Mannheim also believes that knowledge, as part of the constellation, can also influence structural factors when it is transformed into action (1952e:253). Here, Mannheim's views might be likened to those of contemporary theorists who speak of knowledge as being influenced by yet also influencing social structure, including, for example, Archer's notion of 'morphogenesis' (1998:356). Additionally, as Goldman (1994:276) points out, Bourdieu's notions of 'habitus' and 'field' might also seem to share similarities with Mannheim's views in general, and, in particular, his notion of constellation.

On reflection, the problem with Mannheim's apparent lack of clarity about the meaning of determination that Merton takes issue with might simply be connected to the problem with the translation of the German term *Seinsverbundenheit des Wissens* into the English word

determination. It appears that Mannheim never meant this term to be taken to mean determination in its usually accepted form in English at all. As stated in a footnote, which includes an additional comment in the English version,

...we do not mean by 'determination' a mechanical cause-effect sequence; we leave the meaning of 'determination' open, and only empirical investigation will show us how strict is the correlation between life-situation and thought-process, or what scope exists for variations in the correlation. (The German expression '*Seinsverbundenes Wissens*' conveys a meaning which leaves the exact nature of the determination open).
(Mannheim, 1968:239 footnote 1)

Therefore, it seems possible to argue that Merton's problem with Mannheim's use of the term determination may have more to do with semantics and his lack of careful consideration of the meaning of the term 'constellation' than with whether Mannheim's views actually were robust enough for rigorous sociological investigations.

Thus, for Mannheim, examination of the relations between different factors within a 'constellation' is a key element of the sociology of knowledge. To add force to his argument he likens yet also distances his own view from a contemporary, Max Scheler. Along with Mannheim, Scheler is often viewed as one of the first sociologists to be working in the field explicitly called 'sociology of knowledge'. Indeed, Kecskemeti (1952:8) suggests that it was Scheler who first used the term 'sociology of knowledge' to delimit this area as a specific sub-discipline within sociology.

In a critical review of Scheler's essay, *Problem of a Sociology of Knowledge* (1980), which was first published in 1924, Mannheim notes that Scheler's sociology of knowledge accepts three points that are essential for thinking about knowledge in a manner that suggests it forms part of a constellation of factors. First, Mannheim states that in Scheler's work, "thinking [is] conceived as relative to being". Secondly, Mannheim claims that Scheler takes, "social reality as the system of reference in respect of which thought is considered to be relative". Thirdly, he says that Scheler has, "a comprehensive view of historical totality" (Mannheim, 1952a:156). Yet, while Mannheim considers the presence of these three points to be essential for the emergence of a sociology of knowledge, he is critical of the Platonic elements that he detects in Scheler's work.

Mannheim disagrees with Scheler's somewhat Platonic distinction between a realm of pre-existent ideas and a historical realm that sets the boundaries within which only certain of the pre-existent ideas can manifest themselves (1952a:159-160). While accepting that, "a phenomenological separation between Being and Meaning" exists, Mannheim argues that the separation is only a "provisional device" if one accepts that these are mere parts of "one and the same Life" (1952a:161). Here, to defend his view, Mannheim's arguments take on a seemingly Marxist flavour by suggesting first that,

[t]he truth of the matter is that the work and its idea come into being *during* the process of creation
(Mannheim, 1952a:160 emphasis in original)

and later stating that,

[t]he real is not, as in Scheler's system, an always inadequate selection from a transcendent treasure of forms, but a creative concretization flowing from historically unique constellations
(Mannheim, 1952a:165)

However, while the above quotes suggest that traces of Marx's notion of praxis are evident in Mannheim's work, as I will now demonstrate, one of the most explicit debts Mannheim seems to owe Marx is for the way Marx used the term 'ideology'.

To clarify his argument about the context bound nature of knowledge, Mannheim explicitly announced his intellectual indebtedness to Karl Marx's use of the concept ideology (e.g. 1968:66; 1952a:144-145; Merton 1968:547; Remmling, 1975:55; Simonds, 1978:101). In this respect, he provides a historical overview of the concept ideology to demonstrate how its usage in Marxism paved the way for the transition from the theory of ideology to the sociology of knowledge and to loosen its association with Marxism.

Mannheim argues that, in general, there are two different conceptions of ideology. He refers to the first of these conceptions as the 'particular' and to the second as the 'total'. He notes that, while these two conceptions of ideology have some similarities, there are at least three very important differences between them. First, Mannheim claims that in the 'particular' conception of ideology only some of one's opponent's views are regarded as ideologies. However, in the 'total' conception every single part of one's opponent's

Weltanschauung or world-view is regarded as ideological. Secondly, analyses informed by the 'particular' conception of ideology only operate on a psychological level and assume that the criteria used to judge the validity of ideas are identical for all parties involved. In contrast, the 'total' conception of ideology does not assume that the criteria of validity are identical for all those involved. Instead, in the 'total' conception of ideology, the form and conceptual framework as well as the content of a mode of thought are viewed as being a function of one's social position. Thirdly, the 'particular' conception of ideology seeks to link specific ideas to specific interests and motives. Yet the 'total' conception seeks to describe different modes of thought in different social situations. Moreover, in contrast to the individualist approach of the 'particular' conception, the 'total' conception is collectivist because it attempts to reconstruct the total outlook of a social group (Mannheim, 1968:50-53; see also, Hekman, 1986:64-65; Merton, 1968:546-547; Remmling, 1975:54-56).

Mannheim credits Marx for the final shift from the 'particular' to the 'total' conception of ideology. He argues,

[i]n later stages of its development, the word ideology is used as a weapon by the proletariat against the dominant group...It was Marxist theory which first achieved a fusion of the particular and total conceptions of ideology. It was this theory which first gave due emphasis to the role of class position and class interests in thought. Due largely to the fact that it originated in Hegelianism, Marxism was able to go beyond the mere psychological level of analysis and to posit the problem in a more comprehensive, philosophical setting.
(Mannheim, 1968:66)

However, while Mannheim gives credit to Marx for developing a theory that enabled a shift away from a purely psychological analysis of ideology, in his view, Marx did not go far enough.

First, recognising that there are differences within Marxism itself, Mannheim wishes to distinguish his position from what he regards, "as a dogmatic type of Marxism" (1968:247-248), where social groups are only distinguished from one another on the basis of economic class. Certainly, Mannheim seems to agree with the general thrust of Marxist approaches when he states that,

...class stratification is the most significant [form of stratification], since in the final analysis all the other social groups arise from and are transformed as parts of the more basic conditions of production and domination.

(Mannheim, 1968:248)

Yet he is critical of the "one-sidedness" of dogmatic forms of Marxism, which he claims occurs when one factor is regarded as the only factor determining historical development (Mannheim, 1952b:312). For Mannheim, concentration on one factor, here meaning the economy, overemphasises the importance of only one form of stratification, namely, class (Mannheim, 1968:247). Yet, in Mannheim's view, ideologies, that is, modes of thought or world-views, are more numerous than there are economic classes. Moreover, it is his intention to emphasise the importance of the heterogeneous forms of stratification that Max Weber, in particular, had drawn to his attention (Mannheim, 1952a:186 footnote 1). Thus, Mannheim argues that,

[d]ifferentiation in the world of mind is much too great to permit the identification of each current, each standpoint, with a given class.

(Mannheim, 1952a:186)

In this light, he contends that ideologies need to be explored in their multiplicity and accounted for in terms of the mixings of different forms of stratification that make up the social locations of those that hold them (Mannheim, 1952a:186-187).

Of course, if taken to the extreme the type of analysis just described might appear to revert back to an individualistic approach because the variety of possible mixings within the human population might seem as numerous as the human population itself. Consequently, it would seem plausible to argue that ideologies are themselves as numerous as the population at any given moment in time. However, Mannheim repudiates the individualistic view hinted at above (1952b:312). As a result, he holds onto the collectivist approach of the 'total' conception of ideology gained from Marx by arguing that individual thought can be linked to one or more dominant trends in thought that are identifiable within a given historical situation and associated with particular social groups. Drawing again on the work of Max Weber, he urges us to think of these dominant trends or ideologies in terms of ideal-types. These ideal-types serve as "methodological devices"

for the purpose of analysis in the sociology of knowledge (Mannheim, 1968:189). He stresses,

[n]o individual mind, as it actually existed, ever corresponded completely to the types and their structural interconnections to be described. Each individual mind in its concreteness, however (despite all mixtures), tends to be organised in general along the structural lines of one of these historically changing types. These constructions, like Max Weber's ideal types, serve simply for the mastery of past and present complexities.

(Mannheim, 1968:189-190)

As well as criticising Marx's tendency to overemphasise class and underplay the importance of other forms of social stratification in the formation of ideologies, Mannheim is critical of the restricted view of ideology that he claims Marx held. In addition to the distinction Mannheim makes between the 'particular' and the 'total' conception of ideology, which I outlined above, he makes another distinction, which he refers to as the 'special' and the 'general' formulation. For Mannheim, this second distinction is crucial if the transition from the theory of ideology, as it appears in Marxism, to the sociology of knowledge is to occur. Thus, to help clarify each distinction Mannheim writes,

[w]e add here another distinction to our earlier one of 'particular and total', namely that of 'special and general'. While the first distinction concerns the question as to whether single isolated ideas or the entire mind is to be seen as ideological...in the distinction of special *versus* general, the decisive question is whether the thought of all groups (including our own) or only that of our adversaries is recognised as socially determined.

(Mannheim, 1968:68-9 footnote 2, emphasis in original)

According to Mannheim, Marx's theory represents the 'special' formulation of the total conception of ideology since only the thought of the opposing group - in Marxism, the thought of the bourgeoisie - is subject to ideological analysis. Here, in contrast to the opposing group's thought, which is viewed as ideological, one's own position is not called into question and, as such, is regarded as absolute (Mannheim, 1968:68). Yet, by highlighting how numerous non-Marxist groups have adopted Marx's method to debunk their opponents' views (Mannheim 1968:68), Mannheim builds his case for pushing the 'special' formulation of the 'total' conception of ideology towards the 'general' formulation where all views, including one's own, are regarded as ideological. Mannheim argues that when the transition from the 'special' to the 'general' formulation of the total conception of ideology takes place,

...the simple theory of ideology develops into the sociology of knowledge. What was once the intellectual ornament of a party is transformed into a method of research in social and intellectual history generally...it becomes the task of the sociological history of thought to analyse without regard for party biases all the factors in the actually existing social situation which may influence thought.

(Mannheim, 1968:69)

In an attempt to distance himself further from the Marxist 'special' formulation of the 'total' conception of ideology and the negative connotations associated with the term ideology generally, Mannheim suggests that the term ideology should be replaced by the term 'perspective' (1968:239). Yet, regardless of what label is used to describe it, if all modes of thought are regarded as historically and socially determined, Mannheim has an epistemological question to address, namely, how can analyses in the sociology of knowledge escape the charge of relativism?

Undoubtedly, one of the areas of Mannheim's work that has attracted much attention is the way in which he attempted to resolve the question of how studies in the sociology of knowledge or the human sciences more generally, if influenced by his work, could overcome the charge of relativism (e.g. Goldman, 1994:268-277; Hamilton, 1974:128; Harms, 1984:42-45; Hekman, 1986:52-66; Kaiser, 1998:60-64; Merton, 1968:556-562; Nelson, 1992:37-38; Remmling, 1975:69-74; Simonds, 1978:126-132; Stark, 1958:300-306). To overcome the charge, Mannheim introduced two concepts to his work, namely, 'relationism' and the 'relatively socially unattached intelligentsia'. Indeed, Harms claims,

[w]ithin Mannheim's sociology no two conceptions have been so uniformly misunderstood as those of 'relationism' and the 'socially unattached intelligentsia'.

(1984:43)

In light of Harms's (1984) claims, it is my aim to explain and clarify these two concepts. As a result, I will pave the way for later likening Mannheim's solution to the problem of relativism to more recent developments within feminist epistemology. Consequently, I will suggest that, although perhaps not granted explicit credit in their work, Mannheim was, to use his own term, an intellectual 'forerunner' (Mannheim, 1952b:308). For this reason his epistemological contributions, when combined with his detailed account of other concepts related to the sociology of knowledge and the methodological approach he laid down for

studies in the sociology of knowledge, confirm that Mannheim's work is well-suited for my exploration of academic feminism.

Although Mannheim argues that historical knowledge is context bound, he is eager to distance his approach from any association with, "philosophical relativism which denies the validity of any standards and of the existence of order in the world" (1968:254). Indeed, for Mannheim, the existence of identifiable structural factors demonstrates that the world is ordered, albeit in a historically changing fashion (1952b:313). That social groups are positioned differently within historically changing social and economic structures and, consequently, have different experiences and interpretations of these structures, does not deny the fact that there is one totality or reality that can be known, albeit in a multiplicity of ways (Mannheim, 1968:88-89). Neither does the claim that historical knowledge has roots in concrete social groups suggest that such knowledge is necessarily false. Instead, for Mannheim, such insights seem merely to suggest that the knowledge of a particular social group is *related* to their particular experiences of the world and can, therefore, only provide a *partial* insight into the workings of the social and economic totality. It is in this sense that Mannheim adopts the term *relationism*. For Mannheim,

[r]elationism signifies merely that all elements of meaning in a given situation have reference to one another and derive their significance from this reciprocal interrelationship in a given frame of thought. Such a system of meanings is possible and valid only in a given type of historical existence, to which, for a time, it furnishes appropriate expression...All knowledge is oriented toward some object and is influenced in its approach by the nature of the object with which it is preoccupied. But the mode of approach is dependent upon the nature of the knower.

(Mannheim, 1968:76-77)

Mannheim's understanding of the term relationism does not deny that criteria of right and wrong are possible. However, influenced by Troeltsch's historicism, which argues that, "the subject possessing historical knowledge is not a purely contemplative one" (Mannheim, 1952d:101), Mannheim insists that, in the case of historical knowledge, there is no 'divine eye' or disembodied standpoint from which to view the world (1968:94, 254). Consequently, for Mannheim, 'better' knowledge is knowledge that strives to acknowledge

its own rootedness in social reality and integrate as many different embodied viewpoints as possible (Mannheim, 1968:92-94). To this end, Mannheim urges us to see that,

[t]he fragmentary character of all knowledge is clearly recognizable. But this implies the possibility of an integration of many mutually complementary points of view into a comprehensive whole.

(1968:132)

In his attempt to explain how this reflexive, synthesis-searching approach might be achieved, Mannheim identifies a social location that he claims has the *possibility* of granting a wider view of the world than any other location. In so doing, he introduces a term borrowed from Alfred Weber, the 'socially unattached intelligentsia' (*frieschwebende Intelligenz*), (Mannheim, 1968:137-138) to denote the group occupying this location. For Mannheim, intellectuals collectively form a *relatively* classless stratum. He sums up the essential characteristics of this group by saying,

[i]t is an aggregation between, but not above, the classes. The individual member...is *equipped* to envisage the problems of his [*sic*] time in more than a single perspective, although from case to case he [*sic*] may act as partisan and align himself [*sic*] with a class. His [*sic*] acquired equipment makes him [*sic*] potentially more labile than others...[but] Let us re-emphasise at this point that intellectuals do not form an exalted stratum above the classes and are in no way better endowed with a capacity to overcome their own class attachments than other groups.

(Mannheim, 1956:104-105 emphasis in original)

By identifying intellectuals as forming a group that *potentially* occupies the social location affording the widest vision of the social world it is important to stress that Mannheim is not stating that individual intellectuals always strive for synthesis. Mannheim is well aware that many intellectuals do side with one or other party or class without even taking other points of view into account (1968:141-142). Nevertheless, Mannheim argues that there are two key elements that distinguish this group from others in society. First, while acknowledging that a large number of the intellectuals of his time came from the 'rentier strata' (Mannheim, 1968:138), historically, he views the intellectuals as forming an increasingly heterogeneous group in terms of their social backgrounds and, therefore, entering the educational arena from different vantage points (Mannheim, 1968:139, 232-233). Secondly, while claiming that they are socially differentiated from one another, he argues that intellectuals are united by their, "[p]articipation in a common educational heritage"

(Mannheim, 1968:138). Moreover, according to Mannheim, education, by introducing intellectuals to a variety of perspectives and world-views and encouraging debate, equips intellectuals with the ability to critically reflect on "their own social moorings" and to fulfil, "their mission as the predestined advocate of the intellectual interests of the whole" (1968:140). In this sense, it seems possible to liken the potential outcomes of education to that of social mobility, which I mentioned earlier in this chapter, namely, a critical self-awareness and the broadening of one's social vision.

Yet it would be wrong to suggest that Mannheim believes education will inevitably lead all intellectuals to attempt to achieve this reflexive situation, which can be described as acceptance of the 'general' formulation of the 'total' conception of ideology as outlined above. In addition, Mannheim is not saying that acceptance of the 'general' formulation of the 'total' conception of ideology necessarily precludes intellectuals from political affiliation of any kind. Indeed, the type of synthesis that Mannheim believes is required for gaining a more comprehensive vision of social reality is not, in his view, "an arithmetic average of all the diverse aspirations of the existing groups in society" (1968:137). Instead, he claims that,

...a valid synthesis must be based on a political position which will constitute a progressive development in the sense that it will retain and utilize much of the accumulated cultural acquisitions and social energies of the previous epoch. At the same time the new order must permeate the broadest ranges of social life, must take natural root in society in order to bring its transforming power into play.

(Mannheim, 1968:137)

Clearly, Mannheim believes that the achievement of this situation may involve political affiliation once intellectuals have reflected on their own social positions. However, Mannheim argues that if this is the case,

...political affiliation or opposition will be decided on the basis of a *conscious* orientation in society and in accordance with the demands of the intellectual life.

(1968:142 emphasis added)

It is, therefore, the ongoing self-critical process and the desire to achieve the broadest possible vision of social reality at any given moment in history that seems crucial for

Mannheim in securing a valid synthesis, irrespective of whether this process and desire results in any particular political affiliation at given moment in history.

Mannheim's efforts to introduce and explain the concepts of relationism and the relatively socially unattached intelligentsia seem to be directed towards the clarification of his view that,

[a] new form of objectivity in the social sciences is attainable not through the exclusion of evaluations but through the critical awareness and control of them.

(Mannheim, 1968: 5)

In many ways, I would suggest, his outline of how this "new form of objectivity" is to be attained is not too dissimilar from recent calls by many academics for greater reflexivity. Focussing here on some of the suggestions put forward by feminist epistemologists in particular, it will be possible to demonstrate that their arguments are neither 'new' nor, although not acknowledging explicit intellectual indebtedness to Mannheim, dissimilar from Mannheim's, which were made so much earlier in the 20th Century.

Admittedly, the feminist arguments I shall introduce below are directed towards both the natural and human sciences. Mannheim himself clearly does seem to waver on the extent to which he thought his views on the human sciences were also appropriate for at least some areas of the 'exact' or natural sciences since he comments,

...indeed to-day the notion of the stability of the categorical structure of the exact sciences is, compared with the logic of classical physics, considerably shaken.

(Mannheim, 1968:243)

Yet, while hinting that, at least, some knowledge in the exact sciences may share the dynamic nature of knowledge in the human sciences, it is not part of Mannheim's project to examine this issue in depth. Instead, in contrast to the views that I will introduce below, Mannheim's focus is more firmly placed on outlining his views on the human sciences. Nevertheless, it is the similarities in the processes involved in striving for objectivity that I am interested in here, therefore, my comparison is appropriate.

The male bias in academic knowledge has been a central concern of recent feminist epistemological debates and numerous suggestions for how this 'problem' might be overcome have been made (e.g. Alcoff & Potter, 1993; Lennon & Whitford, 1994). However, to suit my purposes here, I shall focus on arguments put forward by two feminist epistemologists. These arguments are Sandra Harding's notion of 'Strong Objectivity', which is intended to extend her feminist standpoint theory (1991:149-163, 1993), and Helen Longino's (1993) notion of 'Multiplying Subjects', which clarifies her notion of 'contextual empiricism' (Longino, 1990) and is a response to the original ideas contained in feminist standpoint theory. While arguing for recognition of the view that the knowledge we receive is always mediated by and affected by one's particular social situatedness, both of these epistemologists are keen to point out that this recognition does not mean that relativism is the inevitable consequence. On the contrary, for both of these theorists objectivity is possible. However, rather than objectivity being viewed as something attained from an Archimedean, or disembodied, standpoint both suggest that objectivity *requires* taking subjectivity into account.

Conscious of criticisms of the feminist standpoint theory that she initially advocated (Harding, 1986, 1987a), which had called for the privileging of knowledge produced from a feminist standpoint, Harding introduced the notion of 'Strong Objectivity' (1991, 1993) into her work. In so doing, on the one hand, she attempted to take account of her critics who had argued that differences between women are myriad, which meant that a feminist standpoint is an unattainable standpoint. On the other hand, she was mindful of arguments that suggested her revision of Marxism, in which women replaced the working class as the most marginalised group, did not take account of other, perhaps, equally, or even more, marginalised groups. It could be added here, why should it be that marginalised groups have better knowledge anyway? Could it not be that they just have 'different' knowledge, an argument that seems in line with Mannheim's views? As a result, Harding introduces the notion of reflexivity to her work, which she sees, "...as a resource for maximising objectivity" (1993:74). Thus, in a manner reminiscent of Mannheim's calls for critical self-awareness she suggests that,

[a] notion of strong reflexivity would require that the objects of inquiry be conceptualized as gazing back in all their cultural particularity and that the researcher, through theory and methods, stand behind them, gazing back at his [sic] own socially situated research project in all its cultural particularity and its relationships to other projects of his [sic] culture...These standards require that research projects use their historical location as a resource for obtaining greater objectivity.

(Harding, 1991:163)

While Harding's emphasis tends to be placed on the reflexivity exercised by researchers, Longino's notion of 'Multiplying Subjects' appears to place more explicit emphasis on Mannheim's notion of striving for the most comprehensive view (Mannheim, 1968:132). Thus, she advocates the development of 'objective communities', which,

[u]nlike the view from nowhere achievable by unconditioned subjectivity or the view from that somewhere identified as maximizing knowledge [in terms of a privileged standpoint, such as a feminist standpoint], this notion of knowledge through interactive intersubjectivity idealizes the view from everywhere (perhaps better thought of as views from *many wheres*).

(Longino, 1993:113 emphasis in original)

In addition, just as Mannheim suggests that knowledge of a subject is never fixed once and for all when he states that, "...synthesis becomes a problem which must continually be reformulated and resolved" (1968:134), so Longino argues that,

[t]he point...is not to produce a general and universal consensus but to make possible the refinement, correction, rejection, and sharing of models. Alliances, mergers, and revisions of standards as well as of models are all possible consequences of this dialogic interaction.
(1993:117)

A third feminist epistemologist, Barwell, whose views do seem to deserve mention as I draw to a close on this brief comparison between Mannheim and certain feminist arguments, suggests that,

[s]ome hybrid account of objectivity based upon the views of the two theorists [Harding and Longino] I have discussed is the most attractive that feminism has been offered so far.
(Barwell, 1994:91)

It may seem ironic, yet, in light of the comparisons that I have made between Mannheim's work and that of Harding and Longino, it seems that the hybrid account of objectivity Barwell calls for may have already been in existence for several years before contemporary feminist epistemology emerged! Consequently, Mannheim's views on objectivity seem well suited for guiding my research on contemporary academic feminism.

In summary, Mannheim's sociology of knowledge bears the marks of a number of intellectual influences. Siding with historicism, Mannheim believes that knowledge in the human sciences is context bound and dynamic. According to Mannheim, such knowledge emerges and exists in society as part of a larger constellation of social factors that, collectively, make up the totality that is social existence. Elements within the constellation are bound up with one another and, albeit to a different extent in different times and places, influence one another. Consequently, Mannheim argues that in studies in the sociology of knowledge no one factor should be regarded a priori as the sole determining factor (1952b:313). Instead, the heterogeneity of social factors needs to be recognised and taken into account during investigations. To deepen understanding of his view of social and historical knowledge, Mannheim draws on and extends Marx's use of the concept of ideology. In so doing, Mannheim calls for the acceptance of the 'general' formulation of Marx's 'total' conception of ideology. In this formulation, all views, not just those of one's opponents, are regarded as ideological and rooted in concrete social groups that are not delineated solely along class lines. Finally, in his attempt to distance his ideas about the type of knowledge under investigation and produced in the sociology of knowledge from charges of relativism, Mannheim introduces two concepts, 'relationism' and 'the relatively socially unattached intelligentsia'. Here, 'better' knowledge in the human sciences is not knowledge produced from a disembodied standpoint. Indeed, for Mannheim, such disembodied knowledge is not possible. Instead, 'better' knowledge is that which emanates from a social location exhibiting critical self-awareness, sensitivity to heterogeneity, a desire for comprehensiveness and an appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge.

1.3: Mannheim's Methodological Approach and Methods

The most important task of the sociology of knowledge at present is to demonstrate its capacity in actual research in the historical-sociological realm.

(Mannheim, 1968:275)

So far in this chapter, I have set out a number of the key themes in Mannheim's sociology of knowledge. Collectively, these themes demonstrate how Mannheim developed his argument for the recognition of his claim that particular modes of thought can only be properly understood if their social origins are taken into account (Mannheim, 1968:1). However, Mannheim was not content to simply leave his arguments in the realm of theoretical debate. Instead, he believed that it was crucial to devise a methodological approach that is suited to the task of informing empirical studies that seek to investigate his claim that social existence is relevant to the form and content of particular modes of thought.

Admittedly, as I will demonstrate in this section, the methodology set out by Mannheim (Mannheim, 1968:275-278) is, as Merton (1968: 555) points out, brief and fairly general. Nevertheless, I believe it provides a sound basis for guiding my research. When formulating his ideas on the sociology of knowledge in the 1920s and early 1930s, Mannheim was convinced that the capacity of the sociology of knowledge had to be confirmed, "in actual research in the historical-sociological realm" (1968:275). My aim throughout my research is to demonstrate the validity of my conviction that Mannheim's methodological approach is still relevant for guiding studies in the sociology of knowledge today.

In this section, therefore, I will provide an outline of the methodological approach that Mannheim proposes for empirical studies in the sociology of knowledge. Here, I will explain the three stages of imputation that he sets out for studies aiming to examine knowledge as part of a 'constellation'. In addition, I will also briefly revisit Mannheim's view that *all* knowledge is related to particular social locations in order to consider the implications this view has for the role of researchers embarking on studies in the sociology of knowledge. Following this, I will comment on the type of methods that Mannheim used throughout his work on the sociology of knowledge. Consequently, I will prepare the ground for the following chapter where I will describe how I employed Mannheim's methodology and methods during my research.

1.31: Mannheim's Methodological Approach

...the main task [of the sociology of knowledge] consists in specifying, for each temporal cross-section of the historical process, the various systematic intellectual standpoints on which the thinking of creative individuals and groups was based. Once this is done, however, these different trends of thought should not be confronted like positions in a mere theoretical debate, but we should explore their non-theoretical, vital roots.

(Mannheim, 1952a:189)

Mannheim's methodology for research in the sociology of knowledge suggests that there are three separate, yet successive, stages of imputation through which the researcher must pass in order to be able to consider the relationships between thought and other social factors. Drawing, in particular, on the methods used for 'dating' and 'placing' in the history of art (Mannheim, 1953:78, 1968:276), the first two stages of imputation that Mannheim advocates consist of "'immanent' analysis" (1952a:189). During these stages the researcher focuses on examining knowledge in isolation from other social factors. In this light, they are the stages of research that Stark refers to as the 'intrinsic' study of ideas (1958:213). In contrast, the third stage, which is the stage when Mannheim believes, "[t]he sociological task proper...begins" (1952a:189), aims to gain a greater understanding of the results from the second stage of imputation by considering them in relation to other social factors. This final stage is referred to by Stark as the 'extrinsic' study of ideas (1958:213). To clarify the content of Mannheim's three stages I will describe each one in turn below.

The two stages of immanent investigation that Mannheim advocates are regarded as representing two different levels of research. The first of these stages, "deals with general problems of interpretation" (Mannheim, 1968:276). During this first stage the researcher aims to detect and describe *Weltanschauungen*, or, in other words, different perspectives or systems of thought. Acknowledging that actual styles of thought are not necessarily part of a closed system, it is the "underlying unity of outlook" (Mannheim, 1968:276) that the researcher aims to uncover here. Once constructed, these perspectives serve as ideal types and Mannheim regards them as "indispensable hypotheses for research" (1968:277). Consequently, as I will explain, these ideal types prepare the ground for the second level of immanent analysis.

In a seemingly Weberian fashion, during the second stage of Mannheim's methodological approach the researcher aims to examine, "...in what measure, in individual cases, these ideal types were actually realized" (Mannheim, 1968:277). Here, admittedly, in my view, somewhat over ambitiously, Mannheim suggests that, "[e]very author of the time accessible to us must be examined" (1968:277). The purpose of this second stage of imputation is to, "...produce the concrete picture of the course and direction of development which has actually taken place" (Mannheim, 1968:277). In so doing, this stage of analysis also illuminates cases of immanent influence. That is to say, it illuminates cases where elements of one perspective influence another and, as a result, produce mixed types. Indeed, Mannheim is acutely aware of the fact that different perspectives do not develop in isolation from one another but instead, "...mutually affect and enrich one another" (1952a:148). Nevertheless, while the second stage may illuminate intellectual mixings, it is the third stage of the research process that aims to widen and deepen the sphere of understanding of, "...the course and direction of [intellectual] development" (Mannheim, 1968:277) that has been detected during the second stage.

Thus, the sociological imputation occurs during the third stage of Mannheim's methodological approach. During this third stage, the knowledge that has been examined during the second stage is considered in relation to other social factors. In other words, knowledge is examined as part of a larger 'constellation' of social factors. In order to try to understand the form and content of the knowledge that is being called into question Mannheim suggests two phases through which analysis at the third stage should proceed. On the one hand, he proposes that it is important to consider, "...the composition of the groups and strata which express themselves in [a particular] mode of thought" (Mannheim, 1968:277). On the other hand, he argues that it is also vital to consider the thought under examination within the context of the broader society. Thus, he urges researchers to,

...seek to explain the impulse and the direction of development of...thought through the structural situation and the changes it undergoes within a larger, historically conditioned whole...and through the constantly varying problems raised by the changing structure.
(Mannheim, 1968:277-278).

As I argued earlier in this chapter, Mannheim does not believe that it is the task of the sociology of knowledge to state once and for all which social factors are always the most important factors for understanding every type of historical knowledge. However, if one acknowledges that all investigations have to start somewhere, it seems that certain *a priori* choices about where to begin the sociological imputation during particular studies are essential. In this light, given the multiplicity of social factors that could be considered, it would seem reasonable to suggest that these *a priori* choices should be guided by a desire to start with factors that might appear to be among the most fruitful for the particular study being undertaken.

In terms of my own study, which is concerned with academic knowledge, Mannheim's work on intellectuals does suggest certain factors that seem to be among those that are most important to consider during the stage of sociological imputation. According to Mannheim, these factors are as follows,

...the social background of the individual; the particular phase of his [*sic*] career curve - whether he [*sic*] is on the upgrade, at a plateau, or on the downgrade; whether he [*sic*] moves up individually or as a member of a group; whether he [*sic*] is blocked in his [*sic*] advancement or thrown back on his [*sic*] initial situation; the phase of a social movement in which he [*sic*] participates - the initial, middle, or the terminal shape; the position of his [*sic*] generation in relation to other generations; his [*sic*] social habitat; and, finally, the type of aggregation in which he [*sic*] performs.

(Mannheim, 1956:158)

More recently, and in addition to the factors Mannheim notes, writers have suggested that important factors to consider when attempting to understand the form and content of academic knowledge include: publishers and publishers' readers (Deem, 1996a:10; Jones, 1992; Spender, 1992); the availability and sources of funding (de Groot, 1997:130; Stanley, 1990a:5) and the level of pressure to publish (Skeggs, 1995:480-481). Just as Mannheim stresses, recent writers also argue that is important to consider more generally the social, economic and political conditions existing within the broader society (Lemert, 1997; Zmroczek & Duchon, 1991:25).

Once the third stage of imputation is complete Mannheim believes that our understanding of the connections between thought and other social factors will be widened and deepened, even if not complete. Moreover, Mannheim believes that, as empirical studies in the sociology of knowledge continue to build upon one another, "earlier intuitive conjectures" will be replaced by "controlled observation". Therefore, our, "systematic comprehension of the relationship between social existence and thought" (Mannheim, 1968:278) will continue to increase.

As well as outlining the three stages that Mannheim proposes for studies in the sociology of knowledge, it is prudent for me to reiterate here that he also provides an account of how objectivity can be maximised in research despite the belief that *all* knowledge is rooted in social existence. This account was described earlier during my discussion of Mannheim's concepts of relationism and the relatively socially unattached intelligentsia. When summarising this account I suggested that, according to Mannheim's view, 'better' knowledge, or knowledge that strives to maximise objectivity, can be attained if one exhibits critical self-awareness, sensitivity to heterogeneity, a desire for comprehensiveness and an appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge. Therefore, it seems that it is these characteristics that researchers should strive to take account of throughout the research process. Consequently, in the next chapter, I will make explicit the ways in which Mannheim's view of objectivity has influenced my work before outlining in detail how Mannheim's three stages have guided my research.

1.32: Mannheim's Methods

I noted earlier in this chapter that Mannheim favoured the use of historical-interpretive methods in the social sciences. Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that Mannheim appears to rely most heavily on qualitative methods throughout his own work on the sociology of knowledge. At times I will make statistical references during my thesis, for example, in

terms of the number of texts examined. Yet my analysis too throughout the three stages of this research will be primarily qualitative.

However, in his essay on "The Problem of the Intelligentsia" (1956), Mannheim does appear to advocate the use of a mixed methods approach. Here, he calls for analysis of statistical data relating to the social backgrounds of the intellectuals under consideration at a given point in time alongside, "analyses of individual life histories" (1956:123). This mixing of methods, advocated as part of what would be regarded as the third stage of Mannheim's methodological approach, appears to be intended to enhance understanding of the particular patterns of thought that circulate within the broader frame of "historically known circumstances" (1956:123) at a particular point in time. I mentioned above that Mannheim suggests there are two phases to pass through when conducting the third stage of analysis, one involving analysis of the context provided by the broader society and the other paying more detailed attention to the social backgrounds of specific authors. Thus, the more detailed mixed methods approach appears to relate more to the latter of these two phases.

It is clear that Mannheim believes both phases of analysis at the third stage are required in order to understand the perspectives of particular individuals at certain points in history (1956:122). However, for reasons that I will make clear in Chapter Two, the more detailed analysis and comparison of individual authors' social backgrounds that would be required during the second phase of Mannheim's third stage will not form a part of this particular study. Thus, while I noted above that Mannheim does propose a number of specific factors that might help to enhance understanding of intellectuals' particular perspectives, many of these factors will not be considered within this study. These are omissions that I will return to address in Chapter Seven.

Regarding the types of sources used for analysis, in addition to the textual analysis that Mannheim advocates for the stages of immanent analysis, throughout his own work his descriptions of other social factors appear to be drawn from existing documents. Although

I believe that Mannheim's use of texts is appropriate for the first two stages of my research. I do have some reservations about relying solely on existing documents for the third stage of my project. However, my reasons for and reservations about deciding to focus on existing documents during the third stage of my research will be clarified in the following chapter when I describe the methods I used during my research.

1.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have situated Mannheim's sociology of knowledge historically and intellectually. In so doing, I have demonstrated the relevance of his social experiences to the development of his work. In addition, I have discussed a number of the major intellectual ideas that influenced Mannheim's sociology of knowledge. Here, I highlighted a variety of the key themes and topics that Mannheim addressed. Consequently, I provided a context for and also, in the process, delivered the means that I believe enhance understanding of Mannheim's methodological approach and methods, which I outlined in the final section of this chapter. Thus, I have paved the way for Chapter Two, where I will describe and explain how Mannheim's methodological approach and methods are employed in my research.

Chapter Two: Methods

2.1: Introduction

In this chapter, I aim to descend from the general, and, admittedly, at times abstract description of Mannheim's work that I provided in Chapter One in order to describe how Mannheim's views influenced the directions that I took during my research and, therefore, manifested themselves concretely within it. To this end, taking account of his concepts of relationism and the *relatively* socially unattached intelligentsia, I will begin this chapter with a section that explains how I, as a researcher, have attempted to ensure that I remain faithful to the type of objectivity that Mannheim advocates for the human sciences. Here, I will make explicit the ways in which each of the characteristics that Mannheim suggests are required for attempting to secure objectivity - critical self-awareness, sensitivity to heterogeneity, a desire for comprehensiveness and an appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge - are evident in my research. To direct the focus more firmly on the subject matter under investigation in my study, in the next section I will briefly restate my research topic, hypotheses and aims. In the remaining three sections, I will describe how each of the three stages of imputation that Mannheim advocates for studies in the sociology of knowledge were conducted in my study. To help illuminate Mannheim's methodology and methods and sharpen them for practical purposes, I will draw on the arguments of more recent writers at certain points during this chapter. However, it will be evident that the suggestions that Mannheim provides for investigating his view of knowledge, which is the view that informs this research, are the ones that form the foundations for guiding my research.

2.2: Taking Account of Relationism:

Increasing Objectivity by Incorporating Reflexivity

Man [sic] attains objectivity and acquires a self with reference to his [sic] conception of his [sic] world not by giving up his [sic] will to action and holding his [sic] evaluations in abeyance but in confronting and examining himself [sic]. The criterion of such self-illumination is that not only the object but we ourselves fall squarely within our field of vision. We become visible to ourselves, not just vaguely as a knowing subject as such but in a certain role hitherto hidden from us, in a situation hitherto impenetrable to us, and with motivations of which we have not hitherto been aware.

(Mannheim, 1968:43)

The best feminist analysis...insists that the inquirer her/himself be placed in the same critical plane as the overt subject matter, thereby recovering the entire research process for scrutiny in the results of research...Thus the researcher appears to us not as an invisible, anonymous voice of authority, but as a real, historical individual with concrete, specific desires and interests...Only in this way can we hope to produce understandings and explanations which are free (or, at least, more free) of distortion from the unexamined beliefs and behaviors of social scientists themselves...Introducing this 'subjective' element into the analysis in fact increases the objectivity of the research and decreases the 'objectivism' which hides this kind of evidence from the public.

(Harding, 1987b:9)

In Chapter One, I argued that Mannheim's views about objectivity are not dissimilar to those that have been promoted more recently by academic feminists. In so doing, I suggested that the similarity I detected between Mannheim's views and those of more recent academic feminists highlights one of the reasons why his work is particularly suited for my feminist research project. Therefore, the purpose of the opening quotes to this section is not only to provide a context for its subject matter, but also to highlight this similarity yet again. In no way do I wish to deny the important impact that feminist approaches to research have, undoubtedly, had on contemporary academic debates. However, it seems somewhat ironic that in Harding's work, published in 1987, one of the features claimed to be 'new' in feminist research, namely, "Locating the Researcher in the Same Critical Plane as the Overt Subject Matter" (1987b:8) and, therefore, making it distinct from other forms of research, is little different from the views Mannheim advocated nearly sixty years before!¹

Thus, remaining faithful to feminist approaches as well as to Mannheim's work, I will begin this section with a general description of how I have attempted to place myself, "...in the same critical plane as the overt subject matter" (Harding, 1987b:9). In so doing, this

description will emphasise the critical self-awareness with which I began my research project and continued to take account of throughout its course. I regard the remaining characteristics that Mannheim seems to suggest are required for attempting to secure objectivity as overlapping one another and intertwined with the general process of securing critical self-awareness. However, for the purpose of clarifying how each of these characteristics is present in my work, namely, sensitivity to heterogeneity, a desire for comprehensiveness and appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge, I will address each of them in turn during the remaining parts of this section.

2.21: Critical Self-Awareness

It is Mannheim's belief that,

[n]o statement about history is possible without the historico-philosophical preconceptions of the observing subject entering its content. The historico-philosophical position of the observer makes itself evident not merely in the sense of a position of assent or dissent to that which is reported, but in the very categories of meaning, in the principle of selection and its direction.

(Mannheim, 1952d:101).

In light of Mannheim's views, the process of acquiring critical self-awareness of my own historico-philosophical preconceptions and making them explicit serves as a means for increasing my own ability to at least reflect on them and, as a result, consider how they have affected my research. In addition, by allowing the reader access to my historico-philosophical position s/he will be conscious of why I decided to embark on this particular research project and why, during its course, it took the shape that it did. Consequently, if one agrees with Mannheim's views about the social rootedness of knowledge, the reader's understanding of my research will be broadened and deepened. In an attempt to avoid the type of 'navel gazing' account that would overshadow the real focus of my project, I aim to strike a balance between extensive autobiography and lack of explicit reflexivity. Therefore, my purpose in this part of the section is to make explicit the ways in which the reader can find evidence of critical self-awareness throughout my thesis that might otherwise remain unnoticed.

¹ Mannheim's *Ideology and Utopia* (1968) was first published in German in 1929.

Apart from during this chapter, which describes my research methods and reasoning behind these methods, there are at least two main points during my thesis where space is specifically granted for explicit consideration of the relevance of my own biography for my research project. These points occur during the Introduction and during the final chapter. As part of the process of situating my project historically, intellectually and politically I provided a brief autobiographical sketch of the background to my research in the Introduction. Here, without tracing them back through my whole life history to their ultimate origins, the personal motivations for embarking on my project, which include my own intellectual and political passions, concerns and experiences, were made explicit. In the final chapter, I will reflect on the methods I used, the findings that arose and my experiences of using Mannheim as my guide during the project.

In addition to autobiographical background material that I provide in the two places mentioned above, I have striven to make explicit how and why I made particular decisions throughout the research process at other points during my thesis. In Chapter One, I provided a detailed account of the view of knowledge that is guiding my research. In addition, I described Mannheim's three research stages, which, as I will later demonstrate, are informing the directions taken during my project. After addressing the other characteristics that Mannheim appears to suggest enhance objectivity in this section, the following sections of this chapter will include explicit accounts of my reasons for and reservations about the choices I made when collecting data for the project. Finally, in the research findings chapters, I will make clear the reasons why I reached particular results.

2.22: Sensitivity to Heterogeneity

Admittedly, the two characteristics, sensitivity to heterogeneity and a desire for comprehensiveness, may, on the surface, appear to be merely two ways of stating the same thing. However, from the outline of Mannheim's work that I provided in Chapter One, I believe it is possible and desirable to attempt to distinguish these two characteristics from one another here in order to consider their implications for the research process.

Thus, drawing on the account that I gave in Chapter One, the former characteristic seems to urge the researcher to acknowledge three things: first, that there are number of different world views in existence that can be investigated; second, that these different world views can be linked to a number of different social groups (i.e. not just groups stratified by class) and third, that these world views and the social groups expressing them are each related, to greater and lesser degrees, to a variety of social factors. In this light, it seems that sensitivity to heterogeneity tends to refer to the choice of knowledge and social factors for investigation. Demonstrating this type of sensitivity would include acknowledging the limitations of a study in terms of, for example, the number of types of knowledge and social factors that it is possible to address in a single investigation. In contrast, comprehensiveness, which I will address in the next part of this section, is a term that Mannheim tends to use for describing the extent to which intellectual claims, following investigations, have taken different views about the topic under investigation into account. In short, for the purpose of discussion here, heterogeneity seems to be directed more towards the choice of subject matter within a study while comprehensiveness appears to refer more specifically to the way the results obtained from the chosen subject matter are reached.

My reasons for wanting to focus specifically on contemporary academic feminism in Britain and the USA have already been made clear in the Introduction. I acknowledge that this focus excludes academic feminism outside these geographical areas. Yet it should already be apparent that some heterogeneity, or at least the possibility for heterogeneity within my research, has been allowed for in the choice of geographical areas and years, namely, 1980 and 1998. In the following three sections of this chapter, where I will describe in detail how I conducted each of Mannheim's three stages, my own sensitivity to heterogeneity within my choice of subject matter will be made more explicit. In these sections, it will become clear that I have attempted to allow for heterogeneity when selecting material for investigation during each of the three stages of analysis.

2.23: Desire for Comprehensiveness

By virtue of its nature, the research process for a Doctoral degree, which involves a period of independent research, might not, on the surface, appear to be well suited for encompassing the type of comprehensiveness that Mannheim advocates. As noted in Chapter One, Mannheim's view is not too dissimilar from Longino's call for the, "...views from *many wheres*" (1993:113), where research claims and results are reached and debated collectively. However, while in no way wishing to suggest that my research could claim to be as comprehensive as that undertaken by a research team made up of the, "...views from *many wheres*", I believe that I have attempted to secure at least a certain amount of comprehensiveness during the project.

Critical examination of my own motivations and assumptions, undoubtedly, has helped me to reflect on how my research might be restricted in its reach. Additionally, background reading led me to consider different points of view. However, at various points throughout the project I have also been able to consider the views of others interactively in face-to-face situations. Within the context of my own university setting, I have been able to discuss and critically reflect on my research during meetings with my supervisors and general conversations with my peers. Rehearsing conference presentations also gave me an opportunity to obtain critical feedback on my research from my peers. In addition, questions and comments taken after presenting aspects of my work at conferences (Torr, 1999, 2000) provided views from outside my own university setting to consider as I continued through the research process. While all these views from 'other wheres' are not explicitly articulated in this thesis, they have, at times, led me to scrutinise my reasons for making particular choices during the research process. Consequently, I believe that I have striven to achieve comprehensiveness within the constraints of independent research.

2.24: Appreciation of the Dynamic Nature of Historical Knowledge

The final characteristic that Mannheim believes must be evident if one is striving to maximise objectivity is an appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge. There are at least three ways that I believe my own appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge is evident in my project. First, my project is comparative and it is designed to consider academic feminism between and within different geographical areas. Secondly, my research considers the extent to which and the ways in which academic feminism between and within the chosen geographical areas has changed over time in terms of guiding perspectives and issues addressed. Thirdly, my study reflects on the changing nature of the broader contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

Together, I believe the descriptions I have provided in this section demonstrate how I have taken account of the characteristics that Mannheim appears to advocate for maximising objectivity. Thus, I will shortly turn to sharpen the focus of this chapter by describing how I proceeded through the three stages that Mannheim sets out for studies in the sociology of knowledge. However, as a means of preparation for this description, I will first provide a brief section that will bring the topic under investigation in my study clearly into view.

2.3: Sharpening the Focus: Topic, Hypotheses and Aims

Before describing how I have employed Mannheim's three stages for studies in the sociology of knowledge during my research, it seems prudent to restate explicitly its intellectual, geographical and historical boundaries and the specific hypotheses and aims that are guiding it. In so doing, I will be able to narrow the focus of the chapter in a manner that will provide a context for the following sections. Additionally, this restatement will also serve as a reminder of the relevance of Mannheim's work for my project.

In the Introduction to the thesis I explained that my research is concerned with academic feminism in Britain and the USA during 1980 and 1998. Without automatically assuming internal homogeneity, Britain, within the context of my project, refers to the geographical area spanning England, Wales and Scotland. Nevertheless, while Britain and the USA formed the focus of my study at its outset and also form the focus of the remaining chapters, problems arising when preparing for Mannheim's second stage of research led me to consider the appropriateness of including anglophone Canada as well. Additionally, conversations with a Canadian colleague confirmed that, in her view, there was sufficient intellectual cross-pollination between Canada and the USA to warrant Canada's inclusion in the project. Thus, again without automatically assuming homogeneity between these geographical areas, I decided to include Canada in my study when selecting data for the second stage textual sample. Therefore, the methods described in section 2.5, 'Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis: Academic Feminism 1980 and 1998', include the processes that I went through when gathering data for Britain and North America, rather than just Britain and the USA. However, practical problems concerning the relative lack of Canadian data, especially in the book sample, later led me to question the validity of drawing tenable conclusions about widespread intellectual shifts in Canada. In addition, my growing concerns about the manageability of the sociological analysis during the third stage meant that I decided to exclude Canada from this particular study. Consequently, it is only the textual data from Britain and the USA that fall within the journal and book samples described below that actually inform the results of my project.

Regarding the years chosen for my project, 1980 seemed appropriate because it marks an outer boundary appearing in the hypotheses about intellectual shifts. Likewise, 1998 was chosen because it also marked an outer boundary in terms of the years addressed in the hypotheses when I commenced the research project.

As I explained in the Introduction my research is guided by four hypotheses. These hypotheses are:

- 1) A shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA during the 1980s and 1990s.
- 2) During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship in Britain and the USA has become increasingly:
 - a) concerned with cultural issues, such as, language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) ones and
 - b) individualist rather than collectivist.
- 3) The shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to the shift in dominant perspectives informing feminist academic work.
- 4) Intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

In the process of examining these hypotheses I intend to achieve four aims. As I mentioned in the Introduction, these aims are:

- 1) To identify and examine changes in the themes and guiding theoretical perspectives of feminist academic work in Britain and the USA.
- 2) To identify and examine material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 3) To consider whether intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 4) To demonstrate that Mannheim's methodological approach is still relevant for guiding studies in the sociology of knowledge today.

Thus, having brought the hypotheses and aims of my research to the forefront of this chapter, it is time to describe how I employed Mannheim's three research stages, which I outlined in Chapter One, to explore them.

2.4: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis:

What is Academic Feminism?

...certain philosophical assumptions lie at the basis of all political thought, and similarly, in any kind of philosophy a certain pattern of action and definite approach to the world is implied.

(Mannheim, 1953:84)

As I mentioned in Chapter One, the first stage that Mannheim advocates for investigations in the sociology of knowledge consists of detecting and describing *Weltanschauungen*, that is, world-views or systems of thought, at a general level. Mannheim argues that all styles of thought are, "...historically developed, dynamic, objective structural configuration[s]" (1953:97) that are, "...closely bound up with the existence and fate of concrete human groups, and [are] in fact their product" (1953:97). However, before attempting to investigate how general styles of thought manifest themselves at particular points in history, he claims that it is necessary to have an idea about which characteristics in a particular example of individual thought might lead one to associate it with a more general, collective *Weltanschauung*. Simply stated, according to this view, before being able to understand the particular ways in which academic feminism manifested itself in 1980 and 1998 it is necessary to have a general idea about what academic feminism is.

Thus, my aim during the first stage of analysis was to attempt to investigate whether, in general terms, it is possible to provide an answer to the question, "What is academic feminism?". To conduct this first stage, Mannheim suggests that a selection of texts should be analysed in order to identify and build up similarities and differences in their core characteristics until it begins to become possible to identify and distinguish general *Weltanschauungen* from one another (1968:276). However, while I followed Mannheim's suggestions in as much as I used a selection of texts for this part of the project, I did not, as Mannheim seems to imply, start out with a *tabula rasa*. My reasons for not strictly following Mannheim during this stage of analysis were twofold. First, in order to complete the project within a reasonable time-scale I had to make sure that it was manageable. If I began the first stage of analysis in the manner that Mannheim suggests it seemed likely

that the project might not proceed beyond the first stage. Secondly, a number of textbooks have already been published that consider general perspectives in a manner that attempts to provide an answer to the same question under investigation in the first stage of my research, namely, "What is academic feminism?". Thus, rather than attempting to reinvent the wheel and risk an unfinished project, I decided that it was prudent to use a number of these texts as my sources for the first stage of analysis.

The results from the first stage of analysis are detailed in Chapter Three. Here it will be evident that even at this general level I was mindful of the need for addressing heterogeneity within academic feminism. However, it will also be clear that, at the same time, I was seeking to consider in what ways, indeed, if in any ways, the general perspectives I outline, despite their differences, can be viewed as variations of a larger unifying *Weltanschauung* called academic feminism. With reference to the particular focus of my research, the results reached during this first stage of immanent investigation were subsequently considered in relation to the first three hypotheses that are guiding my research. This consideration was intended to establish which of the general perspectives outlined seemed most likely to be among those that I would find to be dominant in academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980 and 1998 respectively during the second stage of my research.

In an attempt to inject a more 'concrete' element into my answer to the question posed by Chapter Three, "What is academic feminism?", I decided to take a slight detour from Mannheim's (1968:276) instructions for the first stage of immanent analysis before proceeding onto the second stage. Thus, to try to descend from the often overly abstract perspective descriptions, I decided to map out a range of substantive issues that have been addressed by academic feminism. Here, again, I used a number of textbooks that had already been published but this time considering key issues for research rather than theoretical perspectives. The results from the first stage of immanent analysis prepared the ground for the second stage of analysis. Therefore, I shall describe the methods I used for the second stage in the next section.

2.5: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:

Academic Feminism 1980 and 1998

The second stage of the research process that Mannheim advocates for studies in the sociology of knowledge consists of examining individual cases in order to establish how the more general *Weltanschauungen* detected during the first stage of research actually manifested themselves at particular points in time and space (Mannheim, 1968:277). In order to describe how I prepared for and conducted the second stage of the research process, this section is divided into three main parts. In the first part of the section, I will provide a description of and justification for the textual focus for my research. Here, I will explain why, unlike Mannheim, who suggests that, "[e]very author of the time...must be examined" (1968:277), I decided that it was necessary to draw a sample from within this textual focus. Consequently, during the second part of the section, I will explain the methods I employed when preparing for and drawing the sample. Finally, in the third part of the section, I will describe how the sample texts were analysed.

As I mentioned above, when preparing the sample for the second stage the project temporarily expanded to include Canada as well as Britain and the USA. Therefore, I refer to Britain and North America as forming the geographical boundaries of my project rather than just Britain and the USA when I describe the textual focus and the sampling techniques in the first and second parts of this section. However, for reasons already noted above, only the textual data drawn for Britain and the USA were analysed during this project.

2.51: Textual Focus for the Second Stage

The general textual focus for the second stage was paper-based books and feminist scholarly journals that were published in 1980 or 1998. More specifically, within this general focus, my attention was directed initially towards texts that were written by female feminist academics whose usual location at the time of writing was either in Britain or

North America. In addition, the general focus excluded texts that were explicitly classified as fiction, art, poetry or juvenile. As I will explain below, my reasons for choosing this textual focus were both practical and intellectual.

As I noted above, the years 1980 and 1998 were chosen because both years formed the outer boundaries of those mentioned in my hypotheses when my project commenced. My original intention had been to analyse texts published between these two years as well as during them. In so doing, I would have hoped to establish the directions that academic feminism in Britain and North America had taken as it travelled between the outer boundaries in a systematic, piecemeal and concrete fashion. However, due to the time involved in drawing the sample for and analysing texts published in 1980 and 1998, this initial systematic intention was not possible to fulfil.

While not denying that the boundaries between academic and popular or 'grass-roots' feminism are blurred, my research aims to consider work that would generally be regarded as part of *academic* feminism. Admittedly, despite the label, it is important to stress here that texts that fall within the boundaries of academic feminism, although often, are not always written by feminists who are based within higher education institutions. Mindful of these points and also taking account of the limited time available for searching for suitable texts, I was keen to ensure that my textual focus was firmly directed upon publishing formats and types that would predominantly contain work that would generally be regarded as part of academic feminism.

Therefore, I decided to focus on scholarly feminist journals and books and to exclude works that were explicitly classified as fiction, art, poetry or juvenile. To limit anomalies, even if fiction, art or poetry was to appear in the particular scholarly feminist journals or books that formed part of the sample from within the textual focus, I decided, from the outset, that such work would be excluded. In addition, as I will explain, the journals and books forming the textual focus were paper-based. Increasingly, in recent years, electronic publishing on the Internet has provided a new way of disseminating work.

However, the time required for designing and carrying out systematic searches for electronic texts that would render enough feminist academic work for meaningful analysis in addition to analysing paper-based texts led me to exclude electronic publishing. Paper-based texts were chosen rather than electronic ones for the textual focus as they were readily available in 1980 as well as in 1998.

Manageability as well as concerns about representativeness within the initial textual focus also led me to decide to exclude work that was exclusively authored or edited by male writers. While I am aware of various debates about male feminists and their place within feminism as a whole (e.g. Lorber, 1998; Whelehan, 1995), it is females who make up the overwhelming majority of those who call themselves feminists. Consequently, while excluding one variable from detailed consideration, which, if it was included, might render interesting results, given the boundaries of time, I decided to concentrate on work that was most likely to be usually regarded as feminist, namely, work written by females. I decided not to provide my own definition of which female writers falling within the initial textual focus would be regarded as feminist. Instead, I chose to include authors and editors who explicitly referred to themselves as feminists in their texts or whose work was catalogued as feminist or formed part of a journal or book series that was explicitly promoted as feminist.

Strictly speaking, if I was to remain totally faithful to Mannheim I would have needed to analyse all of the texts falling within the textual focus described above since he suggests that, "[e]very author of the time...must be examined" (1968:277). However, even before carrying out concrete preparations for drawing the sample, which, as I describe shortly, gave an indication of the volume of work potentially falling within the textual focus, it was apparent that a sample would be required if the research was to reach completion. My experience of the volume of work appearing in publishers' catalogues and the numerous journals I had previously used, or been made aware of, during my studies had led me to realise, from the outset, that a sample would be required. Thus, in the next part of this

section, I will move on to address how I prepared for and carried out the sampling for the second stage of my research.

2.52: Preparing for and Drawing the Sample

But we cannot possibly study an intellectual field in its entirety, and almost any considered tactic of selection is better than no tactic at all.

(Ringer, 1990:276)

Apart from bibliometric studies within the fields of information and communications, which attempt to examine trends in publishing and address issues such as cataloguing texts and information use (Gerhard, 1998, Westbrook, 1999), locating appropriate existing work that provided insights into how best to prepare for and draw a sample for my particular study proved difficult. Even within bibliometric studies, Westbrook claims that the only study that attempts to examine the whole field of Women's Studies is a doctoral dissertation by Elizabeth Futas that was completed in 1980 and used information listed in *Women's Studies Abstracts* as its focus (Futas, 1980 cited in Westbrook, 1999:66).²

My study is not too dissimilar from Futas' study in as much as it attempts to cover the broad field of academic feminism.³ Also, just as Futas, I wish to take a general approach rather than focus on the work of one or two authors who are often regarded as key figures. This type of general approach is advocated by Ringer who suggests that,

[i]f we are going to be more rigorously empirical in these matters, intellectual history will have to find ways to sample and to chart intellectual fields, rather than to prejudge the importance of any elements within them.

(1990:276)

Indeed, one of the reasons for conducting my particular study was to consider the extent to which trends that were claimed to have occurred within academic feminism were actually generally evident.

² I was unable to obtain a copy of this dissertation from the British Library or from UMI Dissertation Services which is the central service for accessing doctoral dissertations in the USA.

³ I do not know how broad Futas' definition of women's studies is. I have chosen to use the term academic feminism in my work rather than women's studies. While I believe that the term women's studies is broader than the distinct discipline called women's studies and exists within other more

I did consider the appropriateness of following Futas' lead and using a feminist reference source such as *Women's Studies Abstracts*. However, my reasons for taking a slightly different route were twofold. The first reason was purely practical in as much as I did not readily have access to a searchable feminist bibliographic catalogue. Secondly, and importantly, specialist bibliographic catalogues can be viewed as secondary catalogues since they draw on other, more primary, sources such as, the British Library Catalogue and the Library of Congress Catalogue. I will address below the general problems arising from errors, limitations posed by subject headings and the subjectivity involved when cataloguing texts. However, it is sufficient to say here that specialist bibliographic catalogues are derived from primary catalogues and the problems with cataloguing that I have mentioned can arise each time a text is catalogued. Thus, it seems to follow that any initial problems, potentially, could be doubled when using specialist catalogues. Therefore, I will explain the exact processes involved in preparing for and drawing my sample. Here, because the processes were different for journals and books respectively, I will address each process in turn.

2.521: Journals

The initial criteria I used in my study to define what is meant by the term 'feminist scholarly journals' were taken from McDermott's study of feminist academic journals in the USA, *Politics and Scholarship: Feminist Academic Journals and the Production of Knowledge* (1994). While McDermott sets out seven requirements which, in her view, must be fulfilled for a journal to be regarded as a feminist academic journal within her study, I decided to select only six of them for my study. These six requirements are as follows:

[First,] [t]hey state an intended feminist perspective in either their preface, editorial statement, or content. [Secondly,] [t]hey use academics as editors and consultants. [Thirdly,] [t]hey adhere to conventional forms and styles of academic publishing. [Fourthly,] [t]hey are bound and typeset in accordance with recognized journal appearance. [Fifthly,] [t]hey are abstracted, indexed, and microfilmed in...major academic reference systems. Finally, they are consistently published at regular intervals.

(McDermott, 1994:2)

traditional disciplines the term academic feminism seems to avoid confusion about whether I am specifically addressing work from a distinct discipline called women's studies.

The characteristic that forms part of the criteria for McDermott's study but is missing in mine is that the journals, "...are university based in terms of housing and financial support and operate under the acknowledged auspices of an accredited university" (1994:2). While the North American journals chosen for my study do, in fact, fit this particular requirement, difficulties in finding suitable British based journals for 1980 and 1998 led me to consider it prudent to leave the requirement out.

Rather than taking a stratified probability sample of writings from all journals that fit the above criteria, I decided to take a purposive sample that would allow me to focus on analysing the content of five interdisciplinary feminist scholarly journals that were in publication in 1980 as well as in 1998. As noted below, once the decision was taken to revert back to the geographical focus of Britain and the USA rather than Britain and North America, the journal numbers included in the study were reduced to four. My decision was considered appropriate as it would allow for a deeper consideration of differences and similarities within and between the different journals during the two years than a probability sample would with only one or two articles from particular journals. Thus, the possibility would be open for later considering not only how different publishing formats (books and journals) influence the content of academic knowledge, but also whether differences within the same publishing format are relevant.⁴ As the number of journals analysed was limited, I considered it necessary to strive to ensure that they contained a broad range of writings. Therefore, I decided to select interdisciplinary journals rather than choosing subject specific ones.

Of the five journals initially chosen for my research, three are based in North America - two based in the USA and one in Canada - one is based in Britain and one, by virtue of its title, is explicitly international, although, it was, admittedly, regarded as a British based journal by at least one writer in 1980 (Leonard, 1980b:56). These journals are: *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* (North America - USA); *Feminist Studies* (North

⁴ It will become clear when I address my approach for the third stage that this type of detailed consideration during the sociological stage has been set aside for future research.

America - USA); *Resources for Feminist Research* (North America - Canada); *Feminist Review* (Britain) and *Women's Studies International Forum* formerly, including in 1980, called *Women's Studies International Quarterly* (International).

As well as fitting the criteria mentioned above, these five journals were selected because of their accessibility. *Signs*; *Feminist Studies*; *Feminist Review*; and the 1998 issues of *Women's Studies International Forum* were available within my own university setting. The 1980 and 1998 issues of *Resources for Feminist Research* and the 1980 issues of *Women's Studies International Quarterly* were held by the British Library and available on interlibrary loan. When selecting the North American journals for my study three other possible choices were considered, *Frontiers: A Journal of Women's Studies* (USA); *Atlantis: A Journal of Women's Studies* (Canada) and *Canadian Woman Studies* (Canada). However, while these three journals appeared to fit the selection criteria noted above, none of them were held by my university and it was not possible to obtain all the required issues for any of them from the British Library. For reasons outlined earlier, Canada was dropped before the data for the second stage were actually analysed for the project. Therefore, the data from the one Canadian journal, *Resources for Feminist Research*, do not appear in my study.

The selectivity of my final focus, namely four interdisciplinary journals, inevitably places limits in terms of representativeness. Indeed, a brief survey of scholarly journals using *Feminist Periodicals* (1981, 1998, 1999) and a list produced by the National Women's Studies Association Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards (Pryce, 1999) revealed that at least 111 scholarly journals with editors in the USA or Britain were in circulation in 1980 or 1998 or during both years and regarded as either feminist journals or those containing printed material that was predominantly feminist in orientation. Furthermore, many academic feminists, no doubt, have their work published in scholarly journals that are neither explicitly nor predominantly feminist in orientation. However, in order for the project to be manageable, for reasons outlined above, the criteria set and the resulting choices were believed to be the most appropriate for my study.

For the purposes of analysing the content of each journal issue for the second stage of analysis, I focused on contributions that fitted the criteria set out in the general textual focus above (section part 2.51) falling between editorials and book review sections where these appeared in individual journals. Thus, although short book reviews were excluded from the sample, longer review essays were included provided they fell within the boundaries set. To allow for consistency between journal and author location, the British sample was made up of contributions in *Feminist Review* and *Women's Studies International Quarterly* (1980)/*Forum* (1998) with at least one author who was based in Britain. The USA sample consisted of contributions in *Feminist Studies*, *Signs* and *Women's Studies International Quarterly* (1980)/*Forum* (1998) with at least one USA based author.

In total, 195 contributions formed the journal sample for the second stage of the research. Of these, 109 contributions were published in 1980 and 86 were published in 1998. The 1980 British journal sample included 32 contributions in total. 18 of these contributions were published in *Feminist Review* and 14 were published in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. Bibliographic information for the 1980 British sample can be found in Appendix I. The 1980 USA journal sample included 77 contributions in total. 14 of these contributions were published in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 28 were published in *Feminist Studies* and 35 were published in *Signs*. Bibliographic information for the 1980 USA journal sample can be found in Appendix II. The 1998 British journal sample included 27 contributions in total. 5 of these contributions were published in *Feminist Review* and 22 were published in *Women's Studies International Forum*. Bibliographic information for the 1998 British journal sample can be found in Appendix III. The 1998 USA journal sample included 59 contributions in total. 12 of these contributions were published in *Women's Studies International Forum*, 23 were published in *Feminist Studies* and 24 were published in *Signs*. Bibliographic information for the 1998 USA journal sample can be found in Appendix IV.

In total, 68 non-fiction contributions falling between the editorials and book review sections were excluded from the journal sample for the second stage of the research due to author sex or/and location. Of these excluded contributions, 20 were published in 1980 and 48 were published in 1998. Of the 1980 excluded contributions, 3 were published in *Feminist Review*, 9 were published in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 2 were published in *Feminist Studies* and 6 were published in *Signs*. Bibliographic information for the 1980 excluded contributions can be found in Appendix V. Of the 1998 excluded journal contributions, 15 were published in *Feminist Review*, 16 were published in *Women's Studies International Forum*, 5 were published in *Feminist Studies* and 12 were published in *Signs*. Bibliographic information for the 1998 excluded journal contributions can be found in Appendix VI.

2.522: Books

Lack of readily available access to searchable electronic databases and paper-based indexes solely devoted to feminist publications led me to consider how best to locate, or, indeed, create a relevant sampling frame from which a sample of books could be selected. Taking into account practical issues, such as the time and costs involved in obtaining a suitable sampling frame, and intellectual issues concerning the sampling frame's inclusiveness, I finally decided to attempt to create the sampling frame from data available on three national libraries' Online Public Access Catalogues (OPACs) and one printed national library bibliography. The three OPACs used for this study belong to the British Library (BL) (catalogue.bl.uk), the Library of Congress (LoC) (catalog.loc.gov) and the National Library of Canada (NLC) (www.amicus.nlc-bnc.ca). The printed national library bibliography used was the *British National Bibliography* (BNB) (The British Library, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1997, 1998, 1999). It was added to locate items listed under Dewey numbers that could not be searched for on the BL OPAC.

The data sources chosen for my study were considered appropriate for at least three reasons. First, all the OPACs could be accessed easily from any computer with Internet facilities and the BNB was available in the reference section of Plymouth Central Library. Secondly, the costs incurred using these databases and the printed bibliography amounted only to the costs of the time spent either online or accessing the relevant few pages of particular volumes of the BNB. Thirdly, as national sources, they are the central points for listing new books published within their respective geographical boundaries. Therefore, these data sources were likely to be among the most inclusive, if not the most inclusive, for my particular study.

The final sample used in this study consists only of texts by British and USA based female feminist academics. However, my aim when gathering books for the sampling frame was to create a database that contained a wide range of literature that was authored or edited by British or North American based female feminist academics and published in 1980 or 1998. To achieve this end, certain criteria had to be set in relation to the type of searches conducted and the type of material that would be selected from the results of each search. These criteria will be described in turn below.

Books are initially catalogued by librarians in national libraries such as, for example, the British Library, who draw on qualitative methods to help them reach their decisions about how particular books should be catalogued. Therefore, this cataloguing process inevitably introduces a certain amount of subjectivity when any particular individual is deciding how to catalogue a particular text. In addition, there are limitations placed on cataloguers when they are deciding how to catalogue by the existing recognised subject headings that are available (Westbrook, 1999:67). Mindful of the problems that occur when books are catalogued, I decided, nevertheless, that my data gathering for the sampling frame would have to rely on targeted searches. In order to attempt to ensure that the searches conducted would yield the most relevant and inclusive results for my study, I selected a number of specific search terms and a particular Dewey classification band. This decision was reached after discussing my aims for the sampling frame, namely, striving for

inclusiveness across the disciplines, with librarians in two libraries in order to gather their views on the most appropriate searching techniques. In total, six specific search terms were selected along with one broad band of Dewey numbers.

The Dewey numbers chosen for the searches during my research were based upon the answers gained from the librarians who I consulted about the Dewey numbers that were most usually used for classifying academic work on gender. Specifically, the main Dewey band selected for my study spanned from the classification number 305.3 up to, but not including, 305.5. When searches commenced I realised that the numbers used in this Dewey band had been amended around 1980. Thus, the numbers previously used for this band, namely, 301.41 up to but not including 301.42, were also used when locating work published in 1980.

However, Dewey searches alone were not regarded as sufficient for at least three reasons. The first of these reasons related to my awareness of the fact that a number of feminists might not publish work that would specifically be classified as having its main theme as gender. The second reason, linked, in part, to the first, stemmed from my recognition of the fact that the Dewey band selected was located among the Dewey numbers used for work normally published in the social sciences. From past experience I was aware that a number of books that are not necessarily explicitly from subjects normally classed as social science are catalogued within this Dewey band. However, I was aware of the possibility that many books published, for example, by academic feminists in the arts or natural sciences, might be excluded if Dewey numbers alone were used. Thirdly, although the generally acknowledged Dewey numbers for feminist theory do fall within this broad gender band, it did not necessarily follow that the majority of the books within the whole band would be written by academic feminists. Indeed, while the exact number of non-feminist books appearing within my sampling frame remains unknown, I wished to ensure that it included as many feminist items as I could hope to locate within the time available for catalogue searches.

Thus, as noted above, six specific search terms were selected to complement the Dewey searches in the hope that they would extend the number of feminist texts within my sampling frame and also increase its disciplinary inclusiveness. The search terms chosen were as follows: *feminism*; *feminisms*; *feminist*; *feminists*; *women's studies* and *gender studies*. All six terms were used for subject and title searches on the OPACs. However, results from only five of the terms were retrieved from the subject searches; the term *feminisms* yielded no results as a subject search.

In an attempt to ensure that the texts appearing within the sampling frame would be as relevant to my study as possible, I set criteria to determine which texts appearing on the search results from the OPACs and BNB would be selected. It was possible to conduct the Dewey, subject and title searches by date published, namely, 1980 and 1998. Thus, the criteria set related specifically to which of the texts published during these two years would be selected. The criteria, which I will outline below, focussed on four areas: 1) place of publication; 2) author(s) and editor(s) sex; 3) language and 4) content.

1) Place of publication:

It was during the process of preparing the sampling frame for my project that I decided to extend the geographical boundaries from Britain and the USA to Britain and North America. Thus, at the outset, when locating work for my study I was concerned with locating as many texts that were authored or edited by feminist academics whose usual location at the time of writing was either Britain or the USA. Because the author(s) or editor(s) location is often not identifiable on the bibliographic information that is retrieved from OPAC or BNB searches, it was necessary to consider how to identify results that would be among the most likely for containing work by writers who were based either in Britain and, initially, the USA. In this light, I decided initially to focus on works that were listed as having their first place of publication in either Britain or the USA. Recognition of the fact that many of the larger publishing houses based in the USA provide services for North America led me to consider the appropriateness of including Canada as well. Consequently, it was at this point that I decided to include Canada and extend the study to

cover the whole of North America. However, as already noted above, this extension was later rejected, yet only *after* the sampling frame had been prepared and the sample drawn.

I was aware that the first place of publication of a text would by no means guarantee that the author(s) or editor(s) of works included in the sample were located in either Britain or North America. Moreover, I was also aware that many British or North American based academic feminists might have work published by publishers in locations outside of Britain and North America. However, in order to make the project manageable, it was necessary to set limits. Thus, without access, in most cases, to explicit information about author(s) or editor(s) location, the first place of publication appeared to be a logical choice for beginning to gather together relevant work.

2) Author(s) and Editor(s) sex:

Having established the general geographical boundaries in terms of first place of publication, it was necessary to consider which texts falling within these boundaries would be selected. Thus, as my study focuses on texts written by *female* feminist academics, author(s) and editor(s) sex was the next limit to define. In this light, a number of criteria were set in order to cover the variety of types of work that might be listed in the OPAC and BNB searches. The criteria for inclusion within the sampling frame were as follows:

- Selected works must have a named author or editor. Specifically, for identifying sex, the name(s) must refer to an individual or individuals. Thus, works authored or edited by 'collectives' or 'associations' would be automatically excluded unless they also have at least one individually named author or editor.
- Single authored works must have a female author.
- Joint authored works must have at least one female author.
- The editor of works with one editor must be female.
- Works with two or more editors must have at least one female editor.
- Works with a named author or authors *and* a named editor or editors must have at least one female author - editors do not have to be female.

- Translated works would be included provided that they satisfied the publication location limits and in these cases:
 - a) translated works with named authors must have at least one female author but the translator does not have to be female.
 - b) translated edited works must have at least one female editor but the translator does not have to be female
 - c) translated works with a named author or authors *and* editor or editors must have at least one female author but the editors and translators do not have to be female.

The sex of authors and editors was decided upon from the author/editor information appearing in the search results. The overwhelming majority of entries on the full bibliographic details that appeared on the search results contained the full name of the author or editor. In these cases, I decided that if the name appearing is usually considered to be a female name then the work would be included; if the name appearing could be either a male or female name, it would be assumed that the author or editor in question was female and the work would be included; if the name appearing is usually considered to be a male name the work would be excluded unless female names also appeared on the same listing. In the few cases where only the author's or editor's initials were given it was considered prudent to automatically exclude the work.

Admittedly, the criteria set for detecting author(s) and editor(s) sex could be regarded as problematic. For example, by strictly adhering to the geographical criterion, translated works were included in the sampling frame even though it was likely that the author(s) or editor(s) were not actually located within the required geographical areas. In addition, including ambiguous names might increase the number of works in the sampling frame that are not relevant to my study. Finally, excluding works without the full name of the author(s) or editor(s) could lead to the exclusion of some works that are relevant for my study. However, these 'problems' were considered to be relatively minor ones as the number of translated works appearing in the sampling frame were small (16) in comparison to the total number of works listed, which will be detailed below. In addition,

the number of generally accepted ambiguous names is few in relation to those that are more often accepted as either male or female. Finally, the overwhelming majority of bibliographic records listed the full names of the author(s) or editor(s).

3) Language:

In order to attempt to ensure that the author(s) and editor(s) location requirements were satisfied and, importantly, to ensure that I would be able to read the text, only works written in English were selected for the sampling frame.

4) Content:

Striving to ensure that, as far as possible, the books appearing within the sampling frame matched the criteria that I set out earlier in this chapter when describing the general textual focus of my study, one final requirement was added to the three listed above. This requirement relates to the content of the works that were selected from the OPAC and BNB search results. Specifically, this requirement was that works that are explicitly classified as fiction, poetry, art or juvenile would be excluded.

I created a searchable database using Microsoft Access that would allow me to store and retrieve the items selected for my study from the OPAC and BNB searches. Data entry was carried out alongside the OPAC searches. Searching began in May 1999 and ended in January 2000 when the final cleaning of my Access database was complete. The first searches were conducted on the LoC OPAC as this catalogue had facilities for Dewey searches as well as subject and title searches. Only title and subject searches were possible on the BL and NLC OPACs.

Once the selected items from the LoC searches were input on the Access database the initial results from the BL searches were added. Following this, items that had been located on the LoC catalogue but not on the BL catalogue were checked on the BL catalogue by conducting full title and/or author searches. In so doing, it was hoped that a number of the books located on the LoC Dewey searches would be accessed on the BL

catalogue. In addition, it was also possible to locate on the BL OPAC items that appeared on the initial LoC subject and title key word searches but not on the initial BL searches. Likewise, items from the initial BL searches that did not appear on the initial LoC searches were checked for on the LoC OPAC. This double-checking was considered appropriate for two reasons. First, it would allow me to check the accuracy of the bibliographic information retrieved from each database. Secondly, it would increase the number of relevant items listed as available in the British Library. The importance of this second factor will become evident when I describe how the sample texts were drawn from my Access database.

The next stage of the searching consisted of sifting through relevant Dewey numbers in particular printed volumes of the BNB. This sifting was intended to search for new items, which were in fact negligible, and to check the accuracy of the existing texts on my database. Books appearing during the BNB search that had not been previously identified were double-checked using full title and/or author searches on the LoC and BL OPACs. Following this, the subject and title searches that were set for my study were conducted on the NLC catalogue. During the NLC searches, I was only concerned with identifying items that were listed as published in Canada specifically because, in comparison to books published in either Britain or the USA, the numbers on my database for Canada were very low.

Given that the main publishing location for North America is the USA, the low number of books published in Canada was not surprising. However, targeted subject and title searches were deemed necessary just to confirm that my views about the reasons for the low number of books published in Canada were justified. Having double-checked the results from the NLC searches against the entries already on my Access database, only 11 books retrieved from the NLC searches were not already listed. Although explicitly Canadian sources had not been used for Dewey searches, I considered it prudent at this point not to attempt to locate a suitable source to carry out such searches. This decision was considered to be appropriate for at least three reasons. First, the number of books published in Canada on my database before the NLC searches was relatively low.

Secondly, the number of books that were retrieved during targeted subject and title searches on the NLC that were not already on my database was also very low. Finally, given the amount of time that I had already spent conducting searches, I was aware of the need to start sampling.

When cleaned, the total number of books on my database was 741. Calculated to one decimal point, of the total number of books, 28.1% (208) were published in 1980 and 71.9% (533) were published in 1998. Of the total number of 1980 books, 75% (156) were first published in North America (USA 70.2% (146) and Canada 4.8% (10)) and 25% (52) were first published in Britain. Of the total number of 1998 books, 75.6% (403) were first published in North America (USA 70.9% (378) and Canada 4.7% (25)) and 24.4% (130) were first published in Britain.

However, since my data was obtained from sources in three countries, before drawing a sample from my database I decided that it was necessary to ensure that the sample books chosen would be available in Britain. More specifically, if the books were not available in my university I needed to ensure that I could obtain them by inter-library loan. For this reason, I decided that the sample texts would be drawn from those listed on the final BL OPAC searches, that is after LoC and NLC books had been double-checked for their availability in the British Library.

Consequently, the number of books on the cleaned database that formed the sampling frame for my study totalled 569. Calculated to one decimal point, of the total number of these books, 29.2% (166) were published in 1980 and 70.8% (403) were published in 1998. Of the total number of 1980 books, 68.7% (114) were first published in North America (USA 63.3% (105) and Canada 5.4% (9)) and 31.3% (52) were first published in Britain. Of the total number of 1998 books, 68.5% (276) were first published in North America (USA 66% (266) and Canada 2.5% (10)) and 31.5% (127) were first published in Britain.

From the figures noted above, it is clear that a number of the North American books fitting the selection criteria outlined earlier and appearing on my database were automatically excluded from the sampling frame. However, it could well be that a number of these books have become available in Britain during the time that has past after I finished my searching and, thus, are now listed on the BL OPAC. In addition, the total number of 1998 British books in the sampling frame was three lower than in the original figures. There appear to be at least two possible reasons for the difference in the number of 1998 British books. First, it could be that the information held on the LoC OPAC on the missing books is incorrect. Secondly, the British Library may take longer to list available items on its OPAC than the Library of Congress does. Therefore, although the books might have been available in Britain at the time of my searches they had not found their way onto the BL OPAC.

Nevertheless, the sampling frame for my study contained 569 books in total. Recognising that I would not be able to claim that the sample drawn was representative and taking account of the time available for analysing books within the context of the study as a whole, I decided to include a total of fifty six books in the sample. Therefore, the sample was equal to a little under 10% of the total number of books in the sampling frame. Taking account of the differences in the number of books published in each year and location and the need for a reasonable number from each year and location to make the analysis meaningful, I decided that the sample would have to be weighted. In this light, the breakdown of the books in the sample was as follows: North America 1980 - 10 books (roughly 8.8% of the 1980 North American books); Britain 1980 - 10 books (roughly 19.2% of the 1980 British books); North America 1998 - 24 books (roughly 8.7% of the 1998 North America books); Britain 1998 - 12 books (roughly 9.4% of the 1998 British books). In addition, my desire to ensure that the books selected included a variety of different author and editor combinations led me to break down the sample for each location and year in the following way:

- 1) North America 1980: single author books - 6; joint author books - 1; single edited books - 1; joint edited books - 2.

- 2) Britain 1980: single author books - 7; joint authored books - 1; single edited books - 1; joint edited books - 1.
- 3) North America 1998: single author books - 16; joint author books - 1; single edited books - 3; joint edited books - 4.
- 4) Britain 1998: single author books - 6; joint author books - 1; single editor books - 2; and joint edited books - 3.

The full breakdown of the numbers of each type of book occurring in each year and place of publication can be found in Appendix VII. The sample texts were randomly selected from lists that logged books by year, place of publication and author/editor type. If, on receipt, any of the fifty six books initially chosen were found not to match the criteria set for the study, the book(s) in question were replaced by another randomly selected book of the same author/editor type. Replacement was necessary if, for example, the author(s) or editor(s) location differed from the book's place of publication or there was no female author or editor for a particular book.

The book sample was drawn using North America as one of my geographical locations for both publication and either author or editor location. However, before analysing the data for this study I decided that only the texts with British and USA based authors or editors would be used. As noted earlier, my decision to reject Canada was based, at least partly, on my growing concerns over the time required for sociological analysis during the third stage of my investigation. Yet, once the book sample had been drawn, I was also concerned about the lack of Canadian data in it. Indeed, the book sample for 1980 contained no books with Canadian authors or editors and the 1998 sample only contained three with Canadian authors or editors. Therefore, my ability to make tenable statements about the intellectual scene in North America as a whole seemed questionable. Consequently, I decided to reject the three Canadian books from the 1998 sample and focus the study back onto Britain and the USA. Because the number of books in the, now, 1998 USA sample already greatly out-numbered those in each of the other sample groupings, unlike those already rejected, I decided not to replace the three Canadian

books with alternative USA texts. Therefore, the total number of books in the 1998 USA sample was 21. Of these 21 books, 14 were single author texts, 3 were single edited texts and 4 were joint-edited texts. Lists of the works making up the final book sample for my study can be found in Appendices I (Britain 1980), II (USA 1980), III (Britain 1998) and IV (USA 1998). In addition, lists of the rejected books, which include the reasons for their rejection, appear in Appendices V (1980) and VI (1998).

2.53: Immanent Analysis of the Journal and Book Sample

The analysis of the journal and book sample was qualitative and initially proceeded through three separate levels of analysis. The first level of analysis involved analysing individual texts. The second level of analysis consisted of examining similarities and differences between individual texts that were published in each year and author/editor location respectively. The third level of analysis concentrated on considering similarities and differences between each year and geographical location.

When commencing analysis, I realised that the content of edited books could prove to be slightly problematic given my selection criteria in terms of authorship of knowledge. In short, I was aware that chapters in the edited books within my sample might not necessarily be written by authors who would qualify for the sample had their work been published as, for example, a journal article or a single or joint authored book. Consequently, when analysing edited books, I decided to attempt to capture the general overall flavours of the books and take account of the editors' positioning(s). In addition, I sought to pay particular attention to the chapters that would qualify had they been published as, for example, a journal article or a single or joint authored book.

Upon receipt of each text, I noted down the bibliographic information that appeared inside it. This information enabled me to double-check the accuracy of that appearing on my database, which I had obtained from the OPACs and printed bibliography. The type of information that I noted down included the standard information appearing on

bibliographic records, for example, the author's or editor's name, the title of the book or journal article and journal, the date of publication, the publisher and publisher's location. In addition, if the information was available, I kept records of the author's or editor's professional background - including, for example, whether the author/editor was based in a higher education institution or not and, if so, what the author/editor's disciplinary background was. If texts were noted as having previously been delivered as conference papers, I kept a record of the name, date and location of the conference. Much of the information I wrote down at this point relates to the type of information that is examined during the third stage of analysis, which is the stage of sociological analysis where knowledge is considered in relation to other factors. In the next section, it will become clear that much of the contextualising information that I obtained from the texts was not analysed in this particular study during the third stage. In Chapter Seven, I indicate how this information could be used to deepen analysis at the third stage in future research. When the bibliographic and additional background information for a text had been gathered I proceeded to conduct the first level of the second stage of my research.

During the first level of the second stage of my research, my aims when reading individual texts were threefold. First, when reading a text, I sought to identify and note down the general themes appearing in it. These themes were intended to provide a summary of the text's entire content that I could refer to when the text had been returned to the library. This summary was written down beneath the bibliographic and additional background information that I had already gathered for the text in question. Secondly, in line with Mannheim's approach, I used the general perspectives and key issues that I identified during the first stage of analysis as ideal types against which the text could be measured. As I noted earlier in section 2.4, these general perspectives and key issues are described in Chapter Three.

To identify the theoretical perspectives within each text, I drew on the insights that Mannheim (1952f) provides when he addresses the different levels of meaning within cultural products. Mannheim contends that, "[e]very cultural product in its entirety

will...display three distinct 'strata of meaning': (a) its objective meaning, (b) its expressive meaning, (c) its documentary or evidential meaning" (1952f:44). He argues that it is necessary to take all three levels of meaning into account when attempting to understand a cultural product. According to Mannheim, the objective meaning of a cultural product,

...can be fully grasped without knowing anything about the 'intentional acts' of the individual 'author' of the product or manifestation. All we need to know is the 'system'...that context and whole, in terms of which the data we perceive coalesce into a meaningful entity.
(1952f:45-46)

Within the context of my study, the objective meaning of all the texts had already been set by the selection criteria for the sample. Based on the criteria used for sampling, all of the sample texts were influenced by the general *Weltanschauung* of feminism. Therefore, when reading the texts I was not concerned with identifying their objective meaning. Instead, I sought to identify their 'expressive' and 'documentary' meanings in order to establish which types of feminism were influencing them. The 'expressive' meaning refers to the meaning that the author explicitly intended to convey in the work (Mannheim, 1952f:46). Thus, when searching for 'expressive' meaning within each text I was concerned with identifying the perspectives that were explicitly named as those informing the text. These perspectives were identified by taking note of any general labels, for example, radical feminism, and 'key thinkers' (who are commonly associated with one or more of the general labels) that were explicitly mentioned in the text. The 'documentary' meaning refers to the perspectives that actually appear to be evident when the text is read as a whole. When identifying 'documentary' meaning, concern for any intended approach that is explicitly stated by the author is suspended. Therefore, to identify the 'documentary' meaning I took account of the characteristics that appeared to be evident in the text as I read it, irrespective of the author's explicit intended approach, and considered them in relation to the ideal types that I identified during the first stage of analysis.⁵

⁵ Just because an author says she is influenced by a certain type of feminism or a particular key thinker who is associated with a particular type of feminism it cannot be assumed that the approach she actually takes will appear to reflect these explicit intentions. This is a point that Butler (1993:x, xii; 1995b:134) highlights when emphasising how her work has been misrepresented through, what can be described here as, Goffmanesque readings of her notion of performativity.

After identifying the theoretical perspectives and key issues addressed, I finally examined the text more specifically in terms of the first two hypotheses that are guiding my research. These hypotheses refer to specific shifts in the intellectual perspectives informing the texts and the content of the texts. Thus, I was concerned with identifying which of the theoretical perspectives in the text were the dominant perspectives and considering whether my observations were line with what was predicted by Hypothesis One. The dominant perspectives in the text were taken to be the perspectives that appeared to be influencing the text most heavily. Here, I took account of the perspectives that were argued against in the texts as well as those that provided a positive guiding influence. Next, focussing on the first part of Hypothesis Two, I reflected on the extent to which I thought the content of the text was concerned with cultural issues, such as language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, social and economic (i.e. material) issues. Finally, in line with the second part of Hypotheses Two, I reflected on the extent to which I regarded the text as individualist or collectivist in outlook. Here, I was concerned with identifying whether the emphasis was placed upon seeking ways to understand and analyse the oppression of individual women and their personal responses to it or describing and analysing women's oppression as a collective issue that required collective responses to end it. These more specific reflections were, again, written down in the record that I kept for each text.

Having examined each text individually, the results from the first level of analysis were drawn on in order to allow me to consider texts from the same year and geographical location collectively. During this second level of the second stage of immanent analysis, I aimed to consider similarities and differences in the results of individual texts for the USA 1980, Britain 1980, the USA 1998 and Britain 1998 respectively. This second level of analysis prepared the ground for the third level where I considered similarities and differences in the results across each year and geographical location under consideration in my research. Thus, during the third level, analysis began by examining the results from Britain and the USA in 1980 collectively and the results from Britain and the USA in 1998 collectively. Following this, the results from Britain and the USA in 1980 were considered

in relation to the results from Britain and the USA in 1998. Consequently, this third level of analysis prepared the ground for a fuller comparison of the results from the first and second stages of immanent analysis and discussion of the final results from the second stage in relation to my first three hypotheses. In addition to the first two hypotheses referred to above, the third hypothesis includes the claim that shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to shifts in the dominant perspectives informing feminist academic work. The results from the second stage of analysis appear in Chapter Four and Chapter Five. In Chapter Four, I consider the 1980 texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two. In Chapter Five, I address the 1998 texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two and end the chapter with a summary of the results obtained for both years and geographical areas, which allows me to consider Hypothesis Three.

2.6: Stage Three - Sociological Analysis

The whole life of an historical-social group presents itself as an interdependent configuration; thought is only its expression and the interaction between these two aspects of life is the essential element in the configuration, the detailed interconnections of which must be traced if it is to be understood.

(Mannheim, 1968:278)

Goldman (1994:277) suggests that if studies in the sociology of knowledge focus on contemporary knowledge the methods for gathering contextualising information should include interviewing as well as analysis of existing documents. It had been my original intention to conduct interviews during my research, which I had hoped would provide first hand reflections on feminist academics' group affiliations, their reasons for writing and their perceptions of institutional and broader social, political and economic changes. However, when considering the amount of time that would have been required for tracing, contacting and interviewing British and USA based feminist academics after analysing texts during the second stage of analysis, I decided it was necessary, for practical purposes, to set aside interviewing plans. Thus, just as Mannheim's work, my current research depends upon existing documents. My own exploration of the extent to which

interviews with the authors and editors of sample texts might help to enrich the explanatory power of the third stage of research had to be set aside for future study. Thus, relying on existing documents for my data, the ways in which I proceeded through the third stage of analysis are detailed below.

As I make clear in Chapters Four and Five, multiple intellectual differences as well as many similarities were apparent between and within the journals and the book samples within each of the four groupings (Britain 1980, USA 1980, Britain 1998, USA 1998). Thus, all of these differences as well as similarities would seem to beg to be investigated during the third stage of analysis. However, my decision about how to proceed during the third stage was based upon what was practically manageable within the time and space available and also, importantly, what was actually required in light of the hypotheses that were guiding the project. The fourth hypothesis states that intellectual shifts are related to the material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs. In addition, the shifts that formed the main focus for the third stage in terms of the hypotheses were those that had occurred *between* the years rather than differences within the years. Consequently, marking no more than a starting point for the third stage of analysis, it was the broad intellectual shifts that seemed to be in need of analysis within the context of this project. By the end of Chapter Five it will be apparent that there were certain tendencies in the sample that were in line with what was predicted by Hypotheses One and Two. However, despite these tendencies I did not believe that there was sufficient evidence within the sample to confirm the broad shifts *between* the years that had been predicted by these hypotheses. Nevertheless, at the beginning of Chapter Six, I highlight two intellectual shifts that had appeared to be more generally evident in the sample than those specifically predicted by Hypotheses One and Two. Thus, in order to conduct an exploration that remained sensitive to the results that were gained from the sample as a whole, during the third stage of the project I sought to investigate the two shifts that had been most generally apparent during the second stage.

I stated in Chapter One that there appear to be two phases that Mannheim suggests are required at the third stage of analysis - one addressing the general political, economic and social contexts and the other addressing the specific characteristics of individuals within those contexts. I also noted that Mannheim had furnished a set of factors that might prove fruitful for investigation if one is attempting to understand the work of particular intellectuals. However, because I have already said why I decided to only focus specifically on broad shifts between the years, it is clear that I only focused attention on the first of these two phases during this project. Nevertheless, at least one of the specific characteristics that Mannheim mentions for investigation in the second phase of third stage analysis is accounted for by the focus of the project - namely, the intellectuals in my study are associated with a social movement. Therefore, it seemed appropriate to make this characteristic one of the key factors to explore during my investigations of the broader contexts in the third stage.

Given the multiplicity of general social, political and economic factors that exist and could be examined as part of an investigation of the texts' broader contexts, it was obvious that I would have to be selective. Consequently, the procedure I used to guide me through the third stage of analysis is called inference to the best explanation. This procedure does not claim to exhaust all possible explanations but seeks to identify those that appear to be among the most probable. Thus, I do not deny that other sociological explanations may exist to account for the broad intellectual shifts I identified during the second stage of analysis. However, based, primarily, on my reading of and reflection on existing literature, the political, economic and social factors that I focussed on during the third stage of Mannheim's methodological approach are those that appeared to be among the most likely (Williams, 2000:41-42).

In order to attempt to situate the texts within the contexts of the late 20th Century, I began the third stage by tracking the emergence of Second Wave feminism from the contexts of the post World War Two period and developments within the Women's Liberation Movement during the 1960s and 1970s. Based on my reading of existing literature

focussing on the period spanned, this part of the third stage appears in the form of a relatively straightforward narrative in Chapter Six. The contexts described allowed me to reflect on the 1980 texts in relation to the social movement that they are associated with. However, given that the grass-roots Movement itself appeared to have become increasingly less visible as an organised social movement engaging in relatively large scale collective campaigns by the mid-1980s on both sides of the Atlantic, it was necessary to change my approach. Consequently, rather than attempting to 'coax' material into a fashion that resembled a relatively straightforward narrative, I continued my investigation in a much more tentative fashion that both drew on my previous descriptions of the historical contexts and extended them. Here, I considered a series of specific social, economic and political factors that seemed to be among those that might be relevant. Again, these findings appear in Chapter Six.

Thus, the broad approach that I took when conducting the third stage of analysis represents no more than what might be regarded as a general painting of some of the background scenery. To answer the more specific questions of why certain differences existed between intellectuals or journals within particular sample groupings would require greater analysis and comparison of individual authors' and editors' backgrounds than time and space would allow for in this project. Indeed, given the hypotheses guiding the project, these specific questions also appeared to lie outside the general boundaries of what was required. Consequently, while they are certainly interesting questions that do beg to be answered they had to be set-aside for future research.

2.7: Conclusion

In this chapter, I have described the methods that I employed during my research. Influenced by Mannheim's views about relationism and the relatively socially unattached intelligentsia, I began by describing how I, as a 'knower', have attempted to maximise objectivity during my research. Next, I turned to focus more sharply on how I proceeded

through each of the stages of analysis that Mannheim sets out for studies in the sociology of knowledge. In so doing, I have prepared the ground for Chapters Three to Six where I will describe the findings from each stage of my research. In Chapter Seven, I will draw the thesis to a close by reflecting on the methods employed and findings arising during the three stages of analysis and suggest some directions for further research.

Chapter Three: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis:

What is Academic Feminism?

...one thing is evident: there is no unchanging feminist orthodoxy, no unsettled feminist conventions, no static feminist analyses. Feminism is diverse and it is dynamic.
(Kemp & Squires, 1997:12)

3.1:Introduction

As I have explained in earlier chapters, the first of the three stages of analysis that Mannheim suggests for studies in the sociology of knowledge is concerned with mapping out general perspectives or modes of thought - *Weltanschauungen*. Consequently, my aim in this chapter is to explore, in general terms, the intellectual terrain that is spanned by contemporary academic feminism. Thus, after clarifying in this introduction my intentions regarding my treatment of the intellectual origins of contemporary academic feminism during this chapter and providing a very broad and brief outline of its underlying unifying characteristics, my attention will be focussed on two areas.

In the first section of this chapter, I will sketch out a number of perspectives that are frequently described in existing literature addressing contemporary academic feminist thought. In so doing, I will be able to demonstrate the diverse and multiple nature of the *Weltanschauungen* within academic feminism. In addition, I will be able to clarify the characteristics of the two perspectives that are named explicitly in my first hypothesis, namely, historical materialist and poststructuralist feminism. Consequently, I will consider these characteristics in relation to the first three hypotheses that I will be investigating during the second stage of immanent analysis in later chapters. In the second section of this chapter, I will turn briefly to describe a number of academic feminism's substantive research interests. While, admittedly, not strictly essential for studies following Mannheim's three stages (1968:276-278), I believe that this second section will help to provide a more concrete illustration of what academic feminism is.

I mentioned in Chapter One that Mannheim suggests that it is not the purpose of the sociology of knowledge to search for the ultimate intellectual origins of ideas. Thus, following Mannheim, it is not my intention in this chapter to search for the ultimate intellectual origins of contemporary feminist thought. Admittedly, the intellectual origins of contemporary academic feminism could no doubt be traced back to and beyond the intellectual ideas accompanying what is often regarded as 'first wave' feminism, which Humm (1992:2) suggests was at its most visible in Britain and the USA roughly between the 1840s and the 1920s. Indeed, a small number of the texts falling within my sample for Chapters Four and Five were, in fact, written during the period that is regarded as forming the 'first wave', yet, due to their re-publication dates, these books are counted as part of contemporary academic feminism. Admittedly, at times, during this chapter, I will draw on some of the most immediately recognisable intellectual influences to help illuminate the shape and form of contemporary academic feminism. Here, it will be apparent that different perspectives have evolved through the critique and/or extension not only of existing mainstream or 'malestream' theories, but also of existing feminist perspectives. Nevertheless, my treatment of academic feminism's intellectual history in this chapter is not intended to be comprehensive.

Thus, mindful of the above, how then, at its most general level, can contemporary academic feminism be characterised? Frequently referred to as the intellectual arm of the Women's Liberation Movement (Ruth, 1998:2), contemporary academic feminism in Britain and the USA, as in other parts of the Western world, began to emerge during the late 1960s and early 1970s with the rise of 'second wave' feminism. With its normative commitment to feminism and consequent concern with uncovering and analysing women's oppression, academic feminism has had as a practical goal the prescription of appropriate means to guide feminist action to end that oppression (McClure, 1992:349). Yet, however unifying these underlying characteristics may appear, academic feminism has always been internally heterogeneous in its intellectual orientations and specific research interests (Robinson, 1993: 14). Thus, this heterogeneity will become apparent as I turn to focus specifically on mapping out a variety of feminist perspectives and research interests.

3.2: Diverse Perspectives

...it could be argued that the changes in feminist theory that have taken place, since the practice of trying to assess the distinctiveness of different forms of feminism started in the mid-1970s, have been so profound as to radically question whether such labelling is any longer a useful way of either denoting or discussing current feminist ideas and the influences on them.

(Maynard, 1995:259-260)

I am aware that some feminist academics have come to question whether the process of developing taxonomies that attempt to delineate various feminist intellectual perspectives is politically useful, intellectually meaningful, or, in practice, actually possible. For example, Kemp and Squires caution against the desire to categorize feminist perspectives as they believe that this process not only presents academic feminism, "as [a] simple modification of the pre-existing canon" (1997:11), but also tends, "to polarize perspectives and rigidify conflicts" (1997:11). In addition, as I will outline below, Maynard (1995) argues that there are at least seven reasons for abandoning the taxonomy-building project.

First, Maynard claims that there is no real consensus about the number of categories that could be used to delineate different perspectives within academic feminism (1995:261-262). Secondly, she contends that categorisation has the effect of, "present[ing] feminist theories in terms of narrow stereotypes, rather than as complex and evolving theoretical positions" (1995:261). Consequently, she suggests that there is a tendency to ignore the historical dimension and its effects on knowledge (1995:267). Thirdly, she adds that there is disagreement about which labels are the most meaningful (1995:262). Fourthly, Maynard suggests that disagreement exists about which label should be attributed to particular writers (1995:262). Fifthly, she believes that, by assigning particular labels to particular writers, there is a tendency to ignore the differences that exist between writers who have been given the same label and the similarities between writers who have been given different labels (1995:263). Sixthly, although explicitly addressed by recent taxonomists (e.g. Clough, 1994; Lorber, 1998; Tuana & Tong, 1995; Whelehan, 1995), Maynard argues that classificatory systems have often been ethnocentric by ignoring tendencies that, "have [not] been derived from white, Western and, largely speaking,

Anglo-American perspectives" (1995:264). Finally, she adds that rigid and distinct categories have the effect of excluding writers who, "defy definitive classification" (1995:267) because their work draws on aspects of a number of different perspectives - classic examples of Mannheim's mixed types, which I mentioned in Chapter One.

For Maynard (1995) and Kemp and Squires (1997), just as for others, such as Barrett and Phillips (1992), it is the growing awareness of diversity and fragmentation within academic feminism that has denuded the "taxonomies so beloved" (Barrett & Phillips, 1992:3) in the past by feminist academics of the credibility, whether justified or not, they once held. Thus, clearly, in light of the arguments that I have outlined, before sketching out a variety of feminist perspectives, it seems prudent to re-emphasise why Mannheim suggests that this sketching out is required.

Bearing in mind the arguments of recent feminists, it is important to stress that, for Mannheim, the outlining of general perspectives is only a *starting point*. He in no way suggests that these general perspectives provide an accurate description of thought as it is manifested concretely in particular times and places. Instead, these general perspectives are methodological devices and, as ideal-types, in a strictly Weberian sense, they serve both as a measure against which to discuss and as a tool to aid understanding of particular expressions of thought. For example, as Mannheim suggests when describing the different meanings conservatives and liberals associate with the word 'freedom' (1968:245), general perspectives help to provide an immanent understanding of why sometimes the same word carries different meanings. Moreover, as collective *Weltanschauungen*, these perspectives are intended to help overcome a purely individualist approach to the understanding of thought (Mannheim, 1968:189-90). Thus, rather than excluding authors who, "defy definitive classification" (Maynard, 1995:267), the general perspectives are intended to aid the untangling of intellectual mixings that may appear in individual expressions of thought and their tracing back to collective, yet multiple, *Weltanschauungen*. Finally, by including the second stage of immanent analysis, which investigates the particular ways general *Weltanschauungen* are manifested in

particular texts, and the third stage of sociological analysis the historical dimension *is* present in Mannheim's work.

Having highlighted some of the reservations that have been articulated about the outlining of general feminist perspectives and clarified why, in the context of my research, I believe that the taxonomy I will provide is useful and justified, I will turn to focus more directly on mapping out a variety of perspectives. I will reserve more detailed coverage of two of the perspectives outlined, materialist and poststructuralist feminism, for the last part of the section, since, of all the labels used to delineate different perspectives, these two appear to be most explicitly linked to my hypotheses. To this end, I will begin with shorter overviews of a number of differently labelled feminist perspectives. These shorter overviews will commence with an outline of the perspectives that, at least until recently, were often regarded as the 'Big Three' (Maynard, 1995:259) or, as they will appear here, the 'Big Four': liberal, Marxist, radical and socialist feminism.¹ Following this outline, I will provide a brief listing of some of the main perspectives that have been identified as developing alongside, within and as a critique of the 'Big Four'. Finally, having completed the brief overviews, I will turn to provide a more detailed description of poststructuralist and materialist feminism. Hopefully, it will become clear that different labels do not necessarily delineate discrete perspectives.

In this section, I am mainly concerned with alerting awareness to the diversity within academic feminism. Therefore, it is important to stress that, after outlining the 'Big Four', I will not be attempting to address the additional perspectives in any particular chronological order. Given the historical and geographical boundaries of my project, my attention during this section is directed towards listing perspectives that were in *circulation* in Britain and the USA around, within and between 1980 and 1998. Thus, this focus will allow for the inclusion of perspectives that may have been developed initially by feminists

¹ Maynard states the 'Big Three' "...are usually taken to mean liberal feminism, Marxist or socialist feminism and radical feminism" (1995:259). Discussing all four categories separately in this section suggests that they are (or, maybe, were) the 'Big Four'. Nevertheless, I am aware that that the boundaries delineating different types of feminism are blurred (Jackson, 1998:13). In particular,

residing outside my geographical boundaries. Admittedly, this focus may still leave me open to charges of ethnocentrism. However, within the context of my research, I believe my focus is justified.

I am aware, as Maynard (1995) points out, that numerous categories have been developed to classify different feminist perspectives. In this light, my own listing of perspectives will be, necessarily, selective and, consequently, while I will aim to provide a broad map, the categories listed should in no way be regarded as exhaustive. Instead, drawing on existing literature (e.g. Bryson, 1992; Clough, 1994; Evans, 1995; Jaggar, 1983; Lorber, 1998; Tong, 1989; Tuana & Tong, 1995),² they are intended to represent the categories that are most frequently used to denote the wide range of feminist perspectives. Numerous books have been written that are devoted solely to outlining either multiple feminist perspectives (e.g. Bryson, 1992; Clough, 1994; Evans, 1995; Jaggar, 1983; Lorber, 1998; Tong, 1989; Tuana & Tong, 1995) or single perspectives (e.g. Collins, 1991; Landry & Maclean, 1993; Hennessy & Ingraham 1997; Mies & Shiva, 1993;). However, the relatively limited space available to me for outlining multiple perspectives within the overall context of my research means that, in contrast to these texts, my treatment of each perspective, including the longer accounts of materialist and poststructuralist feminism, necessarily, will be brief. Nevertheless, I aim to provide enough insight to allow for meaningful comparison and understanding.

3.21: The 'Big Four' - Liberal, Marxist, Radical and Socialist Feminism

The first perspective that I will introduce in this part of the section is *liberal feminism*. As its name suggests this perspective draws on mainstream liberal philosophy, which arose during the Enlightenment period as a direct challenge to the authority of the church and its

whether, or the extent to which, the terms Marxist and socialist feminism actually refer to different types of feminism is unclear (e.g. Bryson, 1992; Jaggar, 1983; Tong, 1989; Whelehan, 1995).

² With the exception of the outlines provided of materialist and poststructuralist feminism, unless otherwise indicated the perspectives outlined in this section have been developed from information

supporters who had used literal interpretations of the bible to justify the ascriptive basis of society. Rather than believing that one's position in life is determined by a pre-ascribed role, a central claim of liberalism is that society should be based on individual achievement. According to liberal philosophy, humans are distinguished from non-human life because of their capacity to reason and because, by exercising reason, human beings are able to achieve individual autonomy. To this end, liberal philosophy suggests that all individuals should be granted the same opportunities in order to allow them to choose how to maximise their humanness.

The liberal stress on the *human* capacity for rationality seems to imply that all humans are born equal irrespective of physiological differences (Dunn, 1984:9). However, it is the argument of liberal feminism that mainstream liberal philosophy has not fully extended its views about humanness to half the human race, namely women. In this light, liberal feminism argues for a more complete actualisation of mainstream liberal philosophy. As Bryson argues, liberal feminism,

...retains a clear central core of ideas based upon the belief that women are individuals possessed of reason, that as such they are entitled to full human rights, and that they should therefore be free to choose their role in life and explore their full potential in equal competition with men.

(1992:159)

Ultimately, therefore, liberal feminism remains committed to the belief that once full legal equality and equal economic opportunity is achieved women will be free to become rational autonomous individuals and will no longer be oppressed as a group.

As part of the ideology that acts to legitimate the political and economic systems in liberal-democratic capitalist societies, liberal feminism does not seek to overthrow these systems. Instead, the main goal of liberal feminism is to work for reforms that will eliminate discriminatory practices within current political and economic systems in these societies. For example, liberal feminism argues that girls and boys should not be educated differently and that men and women should have the same opportunities to compete for

employment throughout the professions. In short, liberal feminism aims to create a level playing field, which it believes is achieved when all men and women are granted the same opportunities. According to liberal feminism, once this situation is achieved it will allow all men and women, if they so choose, to compete freely and equally with each other as they strive to maximise their autonomy as individuals.

The commitment to the preservation of individual choice and free competition that is expressed by liberal feminism has frequently led it to be referred to as a form of bourgeois or middle-class feminism that acts to reinforce free-market capitalist ideals. In contrast, *Marxist feminism*, the second perspective within the 'Big Four', drawing, perhaps unsurprisingly, on Marxism, claims that the very same capitalist system that liberal feminism seeks to uphold is responsible for women's oppression in contemporary (capitalist) societies. For Marxist feminism, class analysis must be central to the process of uncovering and explaining the different ways bourgeois and proletarian women experience oppression in capitalist societies. Thus, as Tong points out,

[w]hat is distinctive about Marxist feminism...is that it invites every woman, whether proletarian or bourgeois, to understand women's oppression not so much as the result of the intentional actions of individuals but as the product of the political, social, and economic structures associated with capitalism.

(1989:39).

In contrast to liberal feminism's stress on the abstract human capacity for rationality, Marxist feminism directs its attention firmly on the concrete, historical conditions that are viewed as being systematically produced and reproduced by the capitalist economic system and believed to set limits on what people can think and do.

Therefore, in line with Marxism more generally, Marxist feminism focuses, predominantly, on the analysis of labour in capitalist societies and its effects. In so doing, Marxist feminism argues that Marxism has generally tended to ignore the work that is more often carried out by women than men in the home because it has viewed it as unproductive labour, or labour that does not produce a surplus value in terms of economic profit. As a result, Marxist feminism suggests that Marxism has also tended to ignore the way that this

association of women with unpaid labour in the household under capitalism has acted to legitimate the clustering of women in low waged, lower level jobs when they do enter the workforce. Consequently, Marxist feminism aims to extend and deepen the Marxist critique of capitalism. To this end, it concentrates on developing arguments either for the recognition of unpaid domestic work as productive labour or, accepting its unproductive status, for the provision of publicly funded communal domestic services. In addition, it encourages analyses that expose the way that women, in particular, are exploited as low waged and low status paid workers in the capitalist system.

Marxist feminism, thus, intends to strengthen Marxist calls for a revolution that will replace the capitalist economic system with a socialist system, ultimately leading to communism. Once achieved, Marxist feminism argues that this transformation, ushering in a system where remuneration is based upon need rather than ability, will allow all women and men to become economically independent and, therefore, genuinely equal.

Like Marxist feminism, *radical feminism*, the third perspective within the 'Big Four', is a revolutionary rather than, as liberal feminism, a reformist perspective. Yet, unlike both liberal and Marxist feminism, radical feminism is not a perspective that seeks to extend existing mainstream perspectives. Instead, radical feminism views all existing mainstream perspectives as no more than variations of a general perspective that acts to legitimate, "a world-wide system of subordination of women by men through violence and sexual exploitation" (Lorber, 1998:66). Radical feminism labels this general perspective or ideology and the system it legitimates 'patriarchy'.³ Thus, while Marxist feminism regards class oppression as the most fundamental oppression and, consequently, focuses on seeking ways to overthrow capitalism, radical feminism, viewing women's oppression by

³ Although subsequently deployed more broadly within feminism, the concept 'patriarchy' was developed by early radical feminists such as Millett (1970) and Firestone (1970). Originally intended to add a more sinister tone to the meaning of the existing word 'patriarch' - a term used commonly, for example, to refer to certain male biblical figures holding authority - subsequently within feminism, the concept has been criticised for being ahistorical and its tendency to suggest that women's oppression is monolithic. The 'patriarchy debates' have led some feminists (e.g. Walby, 1989, 1990) to attempt to increase the concept's flexibility and ability to take account of historical specificity. However, others (e.g. Pollert, 1996) have been led to reject it as a useful concept for feminism.

men as the most fundamental type of oppression, focuses on seeking ways to overthrow patriarchy. For radical feminism, since unequal power relations between women and men are foundational they are in fact regarded as the source from which all other types of oppression have developed. Thus, radical feminism contends that when the system of patriarchy is overthrown the ground will be prepared for the ending of all other oppressions.

Admittedly, like so many feminist perspectives, due to its internal diversity, radical feminism is regarded as difficult to define. For example, disagreement exists within radical feminism as to whether male power is biologically determined or socially constructed. In addition, there are divisions about whether male power is primarily perpetuated by actual social relations between men and women or by systems of representation. Yet what makes it most distinct from the perspectives so far outlined is not only its claim that male power is systemic, but also the way that this claim leads radical feminism to demand a politicisation of what are often regarded as the most personal areas of women's lives. Thus, in addition to examining the ways in which male power operates in the public world of, for example, politics, education and the economy, radical feminism draws attention to patriarchal exploitation and violation in areas of women's lives such as childbirth, family life and, more generally, sexuality and sexual relations.

The final perspective within the 'Big Four' is *socialist feminism*. According to Jaggar, this perspective aims to, "synthesize the best insights of radical feminism and of the Marxist tradition and...[consequently]...escape the problems associated with each" (1983:123). For socialist feminism, both of the systems, namely, capitalism and patriarchy, that are addressed respectively by Marxist and radical feminism need to be analysed for the purposes of exposing and explaining, more comprehensively, how each system acts to oppress women. For socialist feminism, neither the insights of Marxist feminism nor those of radical feminism can pave the way for the ending of women's oppression if they are developed and advocated in isolation from each other. Thus, not denying that internal differences do exist within both Marxist and radical feminism, socialist feminism,

nevertheless, can perhaps be viewed from the start as a more *explicitly* hybrid perspective.

While, admittedly, again risking a somewhat oversimplified description that neglects the extent to which diversity exists within this perspective, drawing on, in general, radical feminism and either more orthodox Marxist approaches or the psychoanalytically informed approach of Althusserian Marxism, socialist feminism tends to manifest itself in two different forms. On the one hand, patriarchy, the male system of domination, and capitalism, the economic system of domination, are analysed as separate, yet interlocking, systems. This approach is referred to as a dual-systems approach. However, it is important to note that dual-systems approaches are not uniform. Instead, generally speaking, these approaches are split between two different types. The first type of dual-systems approach regards both capitalism and patriarchy as having a material base in the social relations of their respective modes of production and reproduction. The second type of dual-systems approach regards capitalism as having the same material base as before but draws more heavily on psychoanalytic perspectives and tends to reduce women's oppression to ideology. On the other hand, as an alternative to dual-systems approaches, the second form in which socialist feminism has tended to manifest itself is referred to as a unified-systems approach. Within this approach capitalism and patriarchy are viewed as forming a single, hence, unified system.

Having sketched out the perspectives that are regarded as forming the 'Big Four', I will turn to highlight some of the numerous other perspectives that have been identified as developing alongside, within, and as a critique of liberal, Marxist, radical and socialist feminism in the next part of this section. As I mentioned in the introduction to this section, the additional perspectives I will introduce are neither necessarily exhaustive nor all necessarily distinct from each other. However, as they appear to span a broad range of those that are frequently referred to in existing literature, I believe that these additional perspectives will be sufficient for my purposes of alerting awareness to the diversity of perspectives that exists within academic feminism. While the terms poststructuralist

feminism and materialist feminism will be introduced and, in the case of the former, referred to when describing other perspectives, deeper consideration of both types of feminism is reserved for the part of the section that follows these brief overviews.

3.22: Alongside, Within and Critiquing the 'Big Four' - Additional Perspectives

The first perspective that I will introduce in this brief overview part of the section is *cultural feminism*. With links to radical feminism, cultural feminism is a form of feminism that endorses the notion that there are distinct differences between men and women. Exhibiting internal diversity, cultural feminism regards these differences between men and women as either rooted in biology or as socially constructed ones. Yet rather than advocating a solution that aims to reduce the differences that it identifies, cultural feminism provides analyses that are intended to strengthen its call for a positive revalidation of traits that have been traditionally viewed as 'feminine'. This call for a positive revalidation results from two of the main views that circulate within cultural feminism, namely, that traits that have been traditionally regarded as feminine are at least of equal value to traits that have been traditionally regarded as 'masculine', or that these 'feminine' traits are superior to 'masculine' ones.

Next, *lesbian feminism* provides a critique of what it commonly refers to as 'compulsory heterosexuality'. In so doing, it aims to identify and expose what it regards as a heterosexist bias not only within existing social systems and mainstream knowledge but also within many forms of academic feminism. Like cultural feminism, this perspective often exhibits links to radical feminism. However, at times it also draws on and seeks to extend the insights of socialist feminism. In addition, drawing on elements of poststructuralist theory, some forms of lesbian feminism may often have closer links to *poststructuralist feminism*, or as it is sometimes called, *postmodern feminism*. As I will clarify in the next part of the section, poststructuralist feminism is itself an internally diverse perspective drawing on elements of mainstream theory, for example, Lacanian,

Derridean, and Foucauldian theory. Lesbian feminism in this latter, poststructuralist sense, along with many forms of *bisexual feminism*, is often associated with a wider, not exclusively feminist, approach called *queer*. Reserving more detailed discussion for later, it will suffice here to say that a main focus of approaches employing poststructuralist perspectives is the exposure of knowledge claims to universal truths about the social world and human selves as necessary fictions.

Ecofeminism or *ecological feminism*, sometimes discussed alongside *anarcha feminism*, draws on, in varying degrees in different accounts, primarily, but not exclusively, cultural and socialist feminism. *Ecofeminism* is concerned primarily with the traditional links that have been regarded as existing between women and non-human nature and those that have been claimed to exist between men and culture. In some accounts, ecofeminism also distinguishes between non-white and white men. In these accounts, non-white men are also viewed having been traditionally linked with women and non-human nature. Claiming that culture has traditionally been regarded as superior to nature, ecofeminism seeks to expose how these links and the beliefs pertaining to superiority and inferiority have acted to legitimate the exploitation of women, non-human nature and, in some accounts, non-white men. In this light, ecofeminism strives to develop arguments that aim to encourage action that will eliminate all forms of hierarchy and domination not only between humans but also between human and non-human nature.

Development feminism and *postcolonial feminism* both address the impact of Western domination on non-Western societies. Overlapping with some versions of ecofeminism, development feminism draws heavily on Marxist and socialist feminist theories as well as colonial underdevelopment and post-colonial development theories. In so doing, it, "analyze[s] the position of women in the global economy, with particular emphasis on newly industrializing countries" (Lorber, 1998:46). Postcolonial feminism, also providing, "a sustained effort to identify and criticize globalizing relations of power/knowledge" (Clough, 1994:144), draws more heavily on poststructuralist theories, including those mentioned above, to achieve its aim.

The next perspective that I will highlight is *black feminism*, which is a perspective that critiques and aims to expose the white bias that it claims exists not only within existing social systems and mainstream knowledge but also within many forms of academic feminism. This perspective has links to other forms of feminism that are produced by women of colour and sometimes referred to as *multiracial feminism* or, as outlined above, depending on their emphasis, development or postcolonial feminism. Black feminism takes as its primary focus the analysis of the intersections of 'race' and gender. Often, these analyses incorporate an analysis of class oppression, which is also viewed as intersecting with 'race' and gender. In so doing, they adopt, critique and extend mainly, but not exclusively and to varying degrees, parts of Marxist, socialist and poststructuralist feminism. By developing arguments that are designed to alert attention to the distinctiveness of black women's knowledge, which is claimed to be rooted in the collective experiences of black women (Collins, 1991), some forms of black feminism are also associated with *standpoint feminism*.

While standpoint feminism and a particular form of *feminist empiricism* have been discussed alongside Mannheim's views in previous chapters, it seems appropriate for me to briefly highlight them again here within the more general context of academic feminism. Thus, standpoint feminism, as I mentioned earlier, focuses on epistemological questions, that is, questions related to what can be known, how knowledge is known, and, importantly for the feminist element in these debates, who can know what. Initially, at least, standpoint approaches argued that the knowledge of the world of a particular group of people, which is regarded as the result of their similar social and/or psychological experiences, should be privileged (e.g. Harding, 1986, 1987a; Hartsock, 1983; Smith, 1988). Some standpoint approaches have argued, for example, for the recognition and privileging of women's knowledge, where this knowledge is regarded as relatively homogeneous in content. Others have argued that different groups of women have different experiences from each other and, therefore, different knowledge of the world and develop arguments, for example, for a black women's standpoint.

If multiple women's standpoints are acknowledged, standpoint arguments may, on the one hand, slip towards accepting some of the arguments that have been developed within feminist empiricism. Arguing for the recognition that all knowledge is socially situated, these forms of feminist empiricism (e.g. Longino, 1993; Nelson, 1993) suggest that, by drawing and reflecting on multiple standpoints, reliable knowledge of the social world and human selves is still possible. On the other hand, if multiple standpoints are accepted but all viewed as different and irreconcilable, standpoint feminism may slip towards accepting the arguments of some forms of poststructuralist feminism, as mentioned above and outlined in greater detail below.⁴ When developing arguments, standpoint feminism tends to primarily draw on elements of Marxist, socialist or *psychoanalytic feminism*.

Psychoanalytic feminism draws on various mainstream psychoanalytic theories, which, themselves, are rooted in Freudian psychoanalytic theory in terms of an extension, deepening or critique. Admittedly, many feminists have eschewed Freud's work due to its misogynistic casting of members of the female sex as consumed with penis envy and, lacking penises, physically and mentally inferior to members of the male sex. Nevertheless, psychoanalytic feminism, claiming that, "the root of women's oppression is embedded deep in her psyche" (Tong, 1989:5), seeks to draw on, critique and reinterpret mainstream psychoanalytic approaches for feminist ends. On the whole, psychoanalytic feminism tends to be internally split between the two main directions in which Freudian psychoanalysis has been developed post-Freud. These directions are referred to as object-relations theory and Lacanian psychoanalysis. Object-relations theory takes as its main focus the analysis of how actual social relations impact on the development of the psyche. In contrast, Lacanian psychoanalysis, which is often drawn on in poststructuralist analyses, takes as its main focus the analysis of language and representation and their impact on the development of the psyche. (Flax, 1990:89-132).

⁴ While standpoint feminism, feminist empiricism, and poststructuralist or postmodern feminism are some of the more major epistemological positions often mentioned in existing literature, it is important to note that epistemological arguments and positions within feminism are multiple (e.g. Alcoff & Potter 1993; Lennon & Whitford, 1994).

The final perspective that I will mention in this part of the section is *materialist feminism*. Reserving deeper consideration of this perspective for the next part of the section, my treatment of it here will be very brief. However, it is perhaps important to stress two points, which I will elaborate on later. First, as with other approaches, the term materialist feminism is an internally heterogeneous approach (Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997; Moi & Radway, 1994). Second, it is argued that, due, primarily, to its slippery interpretation in existing literature, materialist feminism is a perspective that is one of the most difficult to define (Gimenez, 2000; Moi & Radway, 1994:749). Indeed, as I will discuss in the next part of the section, the term materialist feminism has been attributed to or claimed by accounts that have links to perspectives such as Marxist, radical, socialist, black and poststructuralist feminism.

As I intended, my outlining of a number of feminist perspectives during this section so far has demonstrated that a diverse range of approaches exists within academic feminism. Moreover, I have suggested that the approaches mentioned are neither necessarily internally homogenous nor always totally distinct from each other. Consequently, in the next section, I will address the two terms that are attributed to certain types of feminism and might both appear to be explicitly related to the hypotheses that are guiding my research. I have, thus far, admittedly and deliberately, merely paid lip service to these two terms, namely, materialist and poststructuralist feminism. Yet it will soon become evident why not only a number of the perspectives already outlined could be regarded as part of materialist or poststructuralist feminism, but also, in some accounts, the very notion that it is possible to clearly distinguish between materialist and poststructuralist feminism is challenged.

3.23: Poststructuralist and Materialist Feminism - Distinct Perspectives?

The first hypothesis that is guiding my research states that during the 1980s and 1990s a shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA. Thus, in this

part of the section, I will focus on the two forms of feminism that, more than any of the other perspectives outlined so far, might appear, at least linguistically, to be most directly linked to my hypotheses, namely, materialist and poststructuralist feminism. As I have already mentioned, these two perspectives are not to be viewed as necessarily distinct from those already outlined above and many of those outlined could be viewed as drawing on aspects of one or the other, or indeed, both perspectives. Moreover, as I will clarify, because of the uncertainty of the meaning of materialist feminism in different accounts (Moi & Radway 1994:749), my own definition of what counts as a historical materialist perspective in my research could be viewed as being both broader and narrower than that which is encompassed by the term materialist feminism.

Taking the perspectives in reverse order, I will begin this part of the section with a description of the views that inform poststructuralist feminism. Following this, I will continue with an outline of materialist feminism. In so doing, I will be able to clearly demonstrate that materialist feminism is a problematic term. In addition, it will be evident that texts that I will identify in the second stage of my research as drawing on historical materialist perspectives are not necessarily to be always assumed to be those that are regarded as part of materialist feminism.

3.231: *Poststructuralist Feminism*

The word does not refer, but creates
(Butler 1986:363)

Despite claims to the contrary, which will become evident in my discussion of materialist feminism, according to Ebert (1996:27), the views that inform poststructuralist feminism, are not unlike those that inform the philosophical position called idealism. Despite internal differences, the common theme within idealism is that, "what we call the external world is a creation of mind" (Williams & May, 1996:199), or, in other words, ideas determine existence. However, poststructuralism, "substitute[s] 'language' for 'mind' or 'consciousness' as the medium out of which beliefs and desires are constructed" (Rorty, 1989:10), and, therefore, stresses the sovereignty of *language*. Moreover, language,

according to poststructuralism, is not a property of individuals. Instead, as I will explain, for poststructuralism, it is ideas or 'fictions' that are formed in language that produce the illusion that individuals are the originators of ideas.

Often drawing on one or more of the three major trends associated with mainstream or non-feminist poststructuralism, Derridean deconstructionism, Lacanian psychoanalysis and Foucauldian discourse analysis, poststructuralist feminism is, like the theories it draws on, heterogeneous. Yet, despite claims that Foucauldians and Lacanians often eschew the approaches taken by each other (Butler, 1997:3) and, "that Foucauldians rarely relate to Derrideans" (Butler 1995a:37), what they do share, and, thus, what unites these heterogeneous poststructuralist approaches, are, "certain fundamental assumptions about language, meaning and subjectivity" (Weedon, 1997:20). These assumptions and their associated preoccupations are linked to the contemporary shift that is claimed to have occurred within the humanities and social sciences and is referred to as the 'linguistic turn' (Fraser, 1995:157). The assumptions are fuelled by an interest in language that is stimulated by the belief that language, as the place where meanings congeal and the medium through which meanings are disseminated, creates rather than describes everything that is non-linguistic. Thus, while acknowledging that heterogeneity exists within poststructuralist approaches in general as well as within poststructuralist feminism, it is the view of language that all of these approaches share that I am interested in describing during my description of poststructuralist feminism. For reasons outlined below, this view of language can be regarded as an anti-descriptivist one.

Thus, poststructuralist feminism, like all approaches associated with anti-descriptivism, deems it imperative that the central focus of all analyses should be language, the meanings it carries and the effects it has on anything that is non-linguistic. The reason for this focus is its belief that rather than merely being a medium for describing or representing meanings that are inherent in non-linguistic things, language is, itself, the attributer of meaning to all that is non-linguistic (Rorty, 1989:4). Simply put, for anti-

descriptivists, it is the meaning that language attributes to non-linguistic things that constitutes them and, consequently, makes them appear in particular ways.

In a manner that is not unrelated to idealism (Williams & May, 1996:199), anti-descriptivism does not deny that there are non-linguistic things. However, what anti-descriptivists are interested in is developing analyses that describe how non-linguistic things, such as the natural world and human flesh and bones, appear to exist in a meaningful way. Thus, anti-descriptivist analyses are designed to demonstrate how the attribution of linguistic meaning has the effect of making what is essentially mute appear to say something intelligible. Indeed, for anti-descriptivists such as poststructuralists, while what is essentially mute and, therefore, essentially without intelligibility may appear to make sense or have meaning, this appearance is, in fact, no more than an illusion (Burr, 1995:57). For example, a piece of wood does not 'tell' me it is a piece of wood. Instead, I have learned that the word, or in poststructuralist terms, signifier, 'wood' carries a particular meaning that is attributed to certain types of non-linguistic things.

With analysis focused at the level of language and concerned with how particular signifiers acquire particular meanings which are then attributed to non-linguistic things, anti-descriptivists, in a seemingly somewhat circular fashion, suggest that individual signifiers acquire particular meanings by being placed in relation to other signifiers. Thus, an individual signifier on its own has no intrinsic meaning. However, according to the anti-descriptivist view, when individual intrinsically meaningless signifiers are placed alongside other intrinsically meaningless signifiers they somehow become meaningful (Burr, 1995:48). Exactly where the meaning that suddenly 'fills up' these individual signifiers once they are placed alongside one another comes from does not seem to be problematized by anti-descriptivists. Instead, their concern seems to be centred more on analysing and exposing how the same signifiers acquire different meanings when the order in which they appear in relation to each other is changed. Let me explain.

According to anti-descriptivists, individual signifiers gain meaning from the broader context they form and are a part of when they join up with one another. This context, in Foucauldian terms, is called a discourse, which Burr defines as, "a set of meanings, metaphors, representations, images, stories, statements and so on that in some way together produce a particular version of events" (1995:48). Moreover, there are often numerous different discourses about the same object. Therefore, the meaning of any particular object in question will change when the signifier that attributes meaning to the object is used within the different contexts these discourses provide.

As an example of the above, poststructuralist feminism takes gender as a primary focus for analysis. In so doing, a major concern is the exposure of how dominant discourses of gender, despite their, often contradictory, differences (Butler, 1990:145), tend to provide frameworks within which the words man and woman acquire different meanings that act to position the terms in a hierarchical relationship of dominance and subordination. In addition, by exposing how discourses of, for example, 'race', class and sexuality interact with discourses of gender, poststructuralist feminism aims to demonstrate how women are not only constituted as being in multiple relationships with men but also with one another. For poststructuralist feminism, as a form of anti-descriptivism, the flesh and bones that are given meanings to constitute them as particular gendered human beings have no intrinsic meaning. Thus, the solution commonly advocated for ending the oppressive naturalising and normalising effects of dominant discourses is their displacement by multiple discourses in which the terms that previously carried oppressive meanings are 'resignified', or, in other words, given new, oppressive-free, positive meanings (Ebert, 1996:41).

Because poststructuralist feminism supports an anti-descriptivist view of language, the types of discourses it advocates as solutions to women's oppression can in no way be regarded as providing either a more or less accurate interpretation of the humans who are given new meanings by language than existing discourses do. However, while this view, perhaps, undeniably, leads to charges of relativism, in defence of poststructuralist

feminism, Weedon offers the pragmatic response that, "we can choose between different accounts of reality on the basis of their social implications" (1997:28).

During my outline of the view of language that underpins poststructuralism I have, at times, linked poststructuralism to idealism. As a philosophical position, idealism can be regarded as the opposite of materialism, which is the term that forms one half of the label used for the next perspective that I will shortly turn to address. However, during the next part of this section, it will become clear that, in some accounts, materialist feminism is informed by and encompasses views that are associated with poststructuralism.

3.232: *Materialist Feminism*

Materialist feminism is not an unproblematic term. Its relationship to what was once called 'socialist feminism' in the 1970s and early 1980s is far from clear. Nor is it obvious what kind of materialism 'materialist feminism' actually claims as its own.
(Moi & Radway, 1994:749, emphasis in original)

Early Materialist Feminists took Marxism as their starting point...Today, MatFem [materialist feminism] is altogether different because it is grounded in the poststructuralist rejection of Marxism.
(Gimenez, 2000:25)

Due to its label, materialist feminism may appear to be the perspective that is linguistically most closely linked to those that are referred to in my first hypothesis as decreasing in dominance during the period covered by my research, namely, historical materialist perspectives. Yet, by attempting to untangle the various ways in which materialist feminism has been defined and deployed, I hope to clarify that this term is, at different times, used to cover either a broader or narrower range of feminist work than that which is encompassed by the term historical materialism. Admittedly, some arguments do just use the general term 'materialist' to denote the type of perspectives that are claimed to have declined in dominance (Kemp & Squires, 1997:7). However, for reasons that will become clear during my outlining of the various ways materialist feminism has been articulated, I believe that the qualifying term 'historical' provides a more specific description of the type of materialist perspectives in question in my research.

Bhaskar suggests that,

[i]n its broadest sense, materialism contends that whatever exists just is, or at least depends upon matter. (In its more general form it claims that all reality is essentially material; in its more specific form, that human reality is).

(1989:125).

In short, therefore, and, perhaps, overly crudely, materialism in its conventional and Marxist interpretation claims that existence determines ideas. In this respect, materialism appears to be the philosophical opposite of idealism, which I briefly defined during my discussion of poststructuralism. However, because of certain contemporary arguments that have been made about the status of language, which I will outline below, answers to the question of what exactly is included within and excluded from the realm of the material and, hence, materialist feminism are not uniform.

Many qualifying terms have been used to attempt to sharpen the meaning of materialism in specific accounts.⁵ For example, when reviewing literature on academic feminism, some of the terms I noted included the following: historical materialism (e.g. Ebert, 1996; Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997); radical materialist feminism (Adkins & Leonard, 1996:15); French materialist feminism (Jackson, 2001:285); cultural or discursive materialism (Ebert, 1996:40); spiritual materialism (Ebert, 1996:34); postmodern materialism (Hennessy, 1993:xv); corporeal materialism, (Braidotti & Butler, 1994:43), "radical materialism in the poststructuralist mode" (Braidotti & Butler, 1994:54) and "materialist in the philosophical rather than marxist sense" (Jackson, 1996:36). While used to denote a number of different forms of materialism, which will be outlined below, they are all linked to work that at some time has been claimed to be part of the perspective materialist feminism (e.g. Gimenez, 2000; Hennessy, 1993; Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997; Jackson, 2001).

Admittedly risking a somewhat oversimplified description, I believe that the various terms mentioned above are generally attributed to work drawing on aspects of one or more of five categories or ideal types. Thus, I will describe these five groupings below. While these groupings will be separated to help provide a clear description of each, despite, perhaps,

⁵ See also Rahman & Witz (2003) for a general discussion of the concept of the 'material' in feminist thought.

being philosophically incompatible, in reality their boundaries are not so distinct as they may appear here.

A) The First Type: The Materiality of Reproducing Matter

The first grouping is one that Jackson (1996) identifies in the work of Mary O'Brien (1981) who, "accounts for women's subordination in terms of their relationship to reproduction or their relationship to their bodies" (Jackson, 1996:36). The materialism resorted to here appears to be of the strictly reductive type, which Bhaskar (1989:125) outlines as form of philosophical materialism known as ontological materialism. This form of reductive materialism, according to Bhaskar,

assert[s] the unilateral dependence of social upon biological (and more generally physical) being and the emergence of the former from the latter
(1989:125).

B) The Second and Third Types: The Materiality of Social Relations

The next two groupings are informed by either more classical Marxist or non-Marxist forms of historical materialism respectively. Historical materialism, which is central to both groupings, is defined by Bhaskar as,

assert[ing] the causal primacy of men's and women's mode of production and reproduction of their natural (physical) being, or of the labour process more generally, in the development of human history
(1989:125)

During his own discussion of historical materialism, Bhaskar adds that it has six, "principal philosophically significant connotations" (1989:126). Therefore, it seems appropriate to restate these significant connotations here in order to aid understanding of the second and third groupings. Thus, these connotations are as follows:

(a) a denial of the autonomy, and then of the primacy, of ideas in social life; (b) a methodological commitment to concrete historiographical research, as opposed to abstract philosophical reflection; (c) a conception of the centrality of human praxis in the production and reproduction of social life and, flowing from this, (d) a stress on the significance of labour, as involving the transformation of nature and the mediation of social relations, in human history; (e) an emphasis on the significance of nature for man [*sic*]... (f) a continuing commitment to simple everyday realism and a gradually developing scientific realism throughout which Marx views the man-nature relationship as asymmetrically internal - with man [*sic*] as essentially dependent on nature, but nature as essentially independent of man [*sic*].

(Bhaskar, 1989:126)

In line with Bhaskar's definition of historical materialism and the six philosophically significant connotations he mentions, both the second and third groupings tend to stress the primacy of the materiality of human activity or praxis in the relations of production and reproduction. Where they tend to differ, as I will clarify, is in their interpretation of the mode of production, which, for Marx, forms the material base.

As I noted above, the second grouping is comprised of the type of analyses that draw on classical Marxist forms of historical materialism. The position endorsed by this form of materialist feminism is, "that economic arrangements - the division of labor that is the basis for class - have definite determining effects under capitalism" (Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997:10). Thus, it is the determining material force of these particular economic arrangements that form the focus for this form of materialist feminism. More specifically, within this particular form of materialist feminism, women's labour is regarded, "as socially necessary and historically essential to capitalist accumulation" (Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997:10). Consequently, analyses are designed to reveal the exploitative nature of women's labour as it is carried out under capitalism and viewed as a result of it. Referring back to the 'Big Four' that I outlined earlier, it is Marxist feminism and aspects of socialist feminism, with their stress on the effects of the capitalist mode of production during their analyses, that perhaps provide the most explicit examples of the type of work forming the second grouping.

The importance of the effects of the capitalist mode of production for deepening understanding of inequality is often not denied in accounts drawing on insights from the third type of materialist feminism. However, the starting point for this non-Marxist form of historical materialism is the claim that the definition of the material base in classical Marxist forms of historical materialism is too restrictive for explaining inequalities that are not solely linked to one's class position (Adkins & Leonard, 1996:11). Thus, for non-Marxist forms of historical materialism, it is the very question of what constitutes a mode of production and reproduction and, thus, forms a material base that is problematised. Consequently, historical materialism is appropriated as a method of social analysis and

used to analyse social relations of domination that are not viewed as direct products of the type of economic system that is traditionally associated with Marxism, namely, capitalism in contemporary societies (e.g. Hartmann, 1981:11; Jackson, 2001:284).

Originating in the detection and examination of patriarchal modes of production and reproduction, which aimed to expose the causes of sexual inequalities as material but social rather than biological (Jackson, 2001:284), the third type of materialist feminism is associated with some forms of two of the 'Big Four', radical and socialist feminism. However, analyses that examine, for example the social relations that create and sustain inequalities of, for example, 'race' have led to the acknowledgement within this grouping that material bases are multiple and not reducible to each other. Thus, particular accounts may, indeed, appear to direct more attention on one set of non-capitalist social relations rather than another, for example, patriarchy rather than 'race'. Yet, taken as a whole, this third type of materialist feminism is,

a version of materialist feminism that foregrounds the social - social structures, relations, and practices - but ...[it] does not reduce all social structures, relations and practices to capitalism. From...[this] perspective patriarchal or gendered structures, relations and practices are every bit as material as capitalist ones, as are those deriving from racism, colonialism, and imperialism. And, of course, all these intersect and interact, often in unpredictable ways, so that the social order is not some seamless monolithic entity.

(Jackson, 2001:284).

Both of the classical Marxist and non-Marxist forms of historical materialism that I have described above stress the materiality of social relations. Moreover, these social relations are viewed as produced by and also the vehicles that can act to either sustain or transform historically and socially pre-existing modes of production and reproduction. Nevertheless, this does not mean that accounts drawing on these two types of materialist feminism neglect the examination of the effects of oppressive dominant ideas about the social world in which these social relations take place. Indeed, oppressive ideologies are a focus for critique that aims to expose their origins and the legitimating purposes they serve. However, in such analyses these dominant ideas or ideologies are viewed as emanating out of and sustaining the particular social arrangements that caused them (Ebert, 1996:7-10). Consequently, the second and third types of materialist feminism

emphasise the need for intervention at the level of social relations to eliminate systemic inequalities. Such intervention might include, for example, withholding labour power or sexual services and it is intended to stop the system operating and, hopefully, initiate systemic changes.

C) The Fourth Type: The Materiality of Ideology or Discourse

In contrast to the first three types outlined above, the fourth type of materialist feminism tends to place much more emphasis on arguing for the recognition of the formative power, or materiality, of ideology or discourse. In accounts drawing on this fourth type, the notion of the material is either expanded to include ideology or discourse (Barrett, 1980:89-90; Hennessy, 1993), or interpreted much more strictly as a matter of language or discourse (Gimenez, 2000:25; Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997:7, 9; Ebert, 1996:27-28). Sometimes, the former draw indirectly on poststructuralist views via extensions of Althusser's Lacanian influenced form of Marxism, which, contrary to more classical forms of Marxism, stresses the relative autonomy and materiality of ideology (Althusser, 1984). Yet they also draw more directly on poststructuralism (e.g. Hennessy 1993). The latter, tend to be limited much more strictly to explicitly poststructuralist influences (Ebert, 1996:27-28).

Because I have already outlined the view of language advocated by poststructuralism that informs the fourth type of materialist feminism in detail my treatment of it here will be brief. However, it is prudent to make explicit the reasons why language, in the form of ideologies or discourses, is regarded by this fourth type of materialist feminism as being material as opposed to non-material. As I noted earlier, poststructuralism emphasises the constitutive power of language or discourse. In so doing, it claims that discourse acts as a material force because it shapes the non-discursive in particular ways. In short, discourses are claimed to be, "material in their effects" (Gimenez, 2000:25). In addition, Ebert states that,

[t]heories that approach materialism as a matter of language, as discourse, base their argument on the assumption that discourse or textuality has an opacity and density of its own, a physicality, that makes language mean not simply by the intention of the author and speaker but by its own autonomous and immanent laws of signification.
(1996:35).

Rather than stressing the need for intervention at the level of social relations, as the second and third forms of materialist feminism do, this fourth type of materialist feminism, regarding language as the creator of social relations, emphasises the need for intervention at the level of language and discourse. Thus, as I mentioned above, during my description of poststructuralism, the process of displacing dominant oppressive discourses consists of exposing their material effects and reworking their linguistic components so that they come to tell different stories and, as a result, act to eradicate domination (Ebert, 1996:28). In addition, linguistic utterances or discourses are regarded as multiple and discontinuous and requiring constant reapplication to essentially meaningless non-linguistic things to make them appear meaningful. Consequently, the fourth type of materialist feminism tends to advocate local and individualistic rather than global and collectivist analyses where specific instances of meaning attribution are examined to establish their particular effects but not regarded as inextricably intertwined with or emanating out of larger systems (Ebert, 1996:28; Hennessy, 1993:21).

D) The Fifth Type: The Materiality of Resisting Matter

Finally, the fifth type of materialist feminism shares many of the characteristics of the fourth because it emphasises the materiality of discourse rather than social relations. However, this last type also interprets materialism as, "the resisting matter of the nondiscursive" (Ebert, 1996:29). Specifically, this type of materialist feminism takes, "the body as the matter under consideration" (Gimenez, 2000:26). It is important to stress that the way the material is interpreted here in the form of the body bears no relation to the reductive form of ontological materialism that I outlined earlier when describing the first type of materialist feminism. In this earlier interpretation, the biological was regarded as determining the social in a unilateral fashion. However, in the fifth type of materialist

feminism the biological is not viewed as determining anything. Instead, as critically described by Ebert, the body in this fifth type is no more than,

an ahistorical, inert, resisting, mass whose existence can be inferred by 'faith or fiction,' by performativity, resignifications, or other ludic rituals.
(1996:34)

Thus, this last form of materialist feminism seeks to analyse instances that expose the way the body exceeds particular meanings that discourses attribute to them (Ebert, 1996:33). These analyses are intended to demonstrate how the body defies discursive attempts to fully determine it in a particular way once and for all. Contrary to certain critical charges (e.g. Ebert, 1996:33), accounts informed by this fifth type do not claim that demonstrating how discourses are exceeded results in an argument suggesting that there is an escape from discourse (Butler, 1997:17). Indeed, since for the fifth type of materialist feminism, matter is essentially meaningless, it cannot appear intelligible unless discourse attributes meaning to it. However, by focussing on how matter is never fully determined, this fifth type of materialist feminism intends to reinforce the views of the fourth type, namely, that human beings who have been oppressed by the discourses that have been attributed to them can be reinterpreted in non-oppressive ways. Because of its tendency to focus on specific instances of resistance, as well as being viewed as ahistorical, this final type of materialist feminism, like the fourth type, is claimed to be an individualist rather than collectivist perspective (Ebert, 1996:32).

Having provided a broad outline of five different groupings within materialist feminism it should be clear that the perspectives deemed to be declining in dominance in the first hypothesis guiding my research are to be found in work drawing on insights of the second and third types. Therefore, it should also be evident that during my research I am not overly concerned about whether a particular work claims or has been attributed the general label materialist feminism. Indeed, as I have demonstrated, due to the differences between the groupings, materialist feminism is, itself, not an unproblematic term.

When discussing materialist feminism some accounts do appear to restrict its content more firmly than other accounts do to the third grouping (e.g. Delphy, 1975). However, other accounts tend to regard materialist feminism as more of a blending between the second and fourth groupings (e.g. Hennessy, 1993). Yet, in addition, materialist feminism has been discussed as a term that is applied to a diverse range of approaches, which, broadly, fall within the first, third and fourth groupings (e.g. Jackson, 1996:36-41); the second, third and fourth groupings (e.g. Hennessy & Ingraham, 1997); or the second, third, fourth and fifth groupings (e.g. Gimenez, 2000) that I have suggested above. Therefore, as I stated earlier, these different interpretations of what materialist feminism encompasses demonstrate that the perspectives that are deemed to be declining in dominance in my research cover both a broader and narrower range of work than that which might be included in specific accounts of materialist feminism. Moreover, it is not only the case that in some accounts the term materialist feminism includes views that I outlined under the heading 'poststructuralist feminism'. Instead, both poststructuralist feminism and non-poststructuralist forms of materialist feminism can be viewed as informing and being informed by a number of the other types of feminism that I outlined earlier in this section.

Without claiming to have exhausted the number of different types of feminism that might be discussed in existing literature, the descriptions that I have provided within this section as a whole have demonstrated that academic feminism is not an internally homogenous *Weltanschauung*. As I mentioned near the beginning of this chapter, it now seems possible to understand that academic feminism's unity does reside within its normative commitment to feminism, its concern with uncovering and analysing women's oppression and aim to prescribe appropriate means to guide feminist action to end that oppression. However, with diverse, albeit, often, intersecting theoretical starting points, the particular foci and consequent prescriptions of academic feminism as a whole are, themselves, multiple and, frequently, necessarily, contradictory.

From the longer descriptions of poststructuralist and materialist feminism that I have provided in this section, it appears that the characteristics of historical materialist perspectives (both Marxist and non-Marxist forms) and poststructuralist feminist (whether regarded as materialist or not) do seem related to claims about the content of feminist scholarship in my second hypothesis. As I have mentioned in previous chapters, this second hypothesis states that during the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship in Britain and the USA has become increasingly: a) concerned with cultural issues, such as, language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material - to which, perhaps, must now be added, material as defined in Marxist and non-Marxist historical materialist perspectives) ones and b) individualist rather than collectivist. Consequently, the third hypothesis to be investigated, namely, that the shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to the shift in dominant perspectives informing feminist work, might seem somewhat redundant if the first two hypotheses are confirmed. However, rather than prematurely drawing conclusions or dismissing the third hypothesis from examination, it still seems prudent to consider all aspects of each of the first three hypotheses during the second stage. In so doing, I will be drawn to consider carefully whether the results of the second hypothesis are actually linked to the results from the first hypothesis.

For the purposes of enabling me to proceed onto the second stage of my research in a manner that strictly follows Mannheim (1968:276-277), I believe that the perspective outlines provided thus far are sufficient. However, the description of theoretical positionings that I have provided in this section has been mainly conducted at a rather abstract level. Thus, in an attempt to add greater substance to my answer to the question posed by this chapter, 'What is Academic Feminism?', a short overview section mentioning a wide, although not exhaustive, range of research interests towards which the perspectives already outlined are directed seems in order. Both making more explicit some of the research interests that I have already mentioned by bringing them to the centre of attention and adding to the list, the following section will confirm my earlier claim

that academic feminism is not only internally diverse in its theoretical perspectives, but also in its research orientations.

3.3: Diverse Research Interests

I have already mentioned a number of research areas that academic feminism focuses on when discussing particular theoretical perspectives above. However, while intended to help understanding of particular perspectives, it is important to note that the research areas that I have mentioned are not necessarily exclusive to particular perspectives and that particular perspectives are not necessarily limited in their application to the research areas I used to illuminate them. Academic feminism's research interests are multiple, and, while frequently overlapping, cover a diverse range of areas. Moreover, each research area can be approached from different disciplinary angles and theoretical perspectives and at theoretical as well as empirical levels. Therefore, it might suffice to simply invoke the popular feminist statement, 'every issue is a feminist issue', and from this merely infer that as a logical conclusion academic feminism addresses all issues in many ways. However, in order to demonstrate explicitly the range of issues addressed, it seems appropriate to provide an overview of some of the main issues that frequently come to mind when the scope of academic feminism is being introduced (e.g. Cosslett et al., 1996; Jackson et al., 1993a; Kemp & Squires, 1997; Richardson & Robinson, 1993; Ruth, 1998).⁶ It must be stressed that the research areas listed in this section are neither exhaustive nor always addressed in isolation from each other. In addition, due to the limited space available for addressing these general research areas within the context of my thesis, my description of the ways each area has been approached is, necessarily, both brief and incomplete. No attempt has been made to list the research areas that I will mention below in order of priority or chronologically. In short, the list merely intends to

⁶ The list of research areas and brief overviews provided in this section have been selected from and primarily informed by the content of these texts. All of these texts are designed to provide university level students who are relatively new to the field with broad overviews of the various research areas of academic feminism. A multiplicity of general texts exists, yet the texts selected to inform this section provide a broad enough range of key research areas for my purposes.

make explicit a number of academic feminism's substantive interests and, in so doing, demonstrate diversity without claiming comprehensiveness.

First, a major research area addressed by academic feminism, which, like a number in this section, has been mentioned earlier in the chapter, is *women and work* (see e.g. Crompton, 1997; Crompton & Sanderson, 1990; Prince, 1993; Rotella, 1998; Witz, 1993). Within this general research area, academic feminists have addressed multiple issues connected to women and both paid and unpaid work. For example, regarding paid work, the scope includes analysing the horizontal and vertical segregation of men and women in the workforce (Witz, 1993:280-284, Rotella, 1998:354-356). With regard to the former, the proliferation of women in certain forms of employment and their exclusion or under-representation in other forms of employment is analysed. With regard to the latter, both the under-representation of women in and, in some cases, their exclusion from managerial positions is explored. Investigations into the different remuneration men and women sometimes receive for the same or equivalent type of work they do have also been conducted (Rotella, 1998:352-354). Additionally, academic feminists have addressed the problems of sexual harassment and the (hetero)sexualization of the workplace (Witz, 1993:289-291; Hall, 1989).

Women's unpaid domestic labour has also attracted enormous research interest. For example, inquiry into why so much domestic labour is often unpaid has been a central area of research (Dalla Costa & James, 1972; German, 1989). In addition, both the unequal share of domestic responsibilities frequently regarded as occurring between men and women and the related 'double burden' carried by women who engage in both paid and unpaid work has been critically addressed (Rotella, 1998:348).

Overlapping somewhat with the area of women's unpaid domestic labour, *marriage, motherhood and families* is another research area addressed by academic feminism (see e.g. Dunne, 2000; Faulkner & Jackson, 1993; Finch, 1996; Jackson, 1993a; Nicolson, 1993). On the one hand, within this area, the expectations placed upon women regarding

marriage, motherhood and family life are analysed. On the other hand, women's own experiences of marriage, motherhood and family life are investigated. Analyses might include, for example, investigations into the differences between women from a range of ethnic groups and family forms. In so doing, such analyses help to expose "the white heterosexual middle-class myth of the 'typical' nuclear family" (Jackson, 1993a:178). In addition, studies examine the social processes involved in training girls and young women how to mother (Nicolson, 1993:211). Studies also explore the ways that certain women are labelled as abnormal if they do not comply with society's general expectations of them in relation to motherhood. Here, these women may include childless married women, married women desiring or requesting abortion and lesbians and single or unmarried heterosexual women with children. Such studies suggest that all these women are viewed as going against what is natural or acceptable because the idea of the family as a unit made up of a heterosexual married couple with two or three children is still so pervasive even if in reality it is not the norm (Nicolson, 1993:215-216). Finally, domestic violence is another example of a focus for research when examining gendered power relations in the home (Gibbs, 1993).

Domestic violence is also part of the general research area of *violence against women* (see e.g. Brownmiller, 1975; Griffin, 1979; Maynard, 1993). The area of violence against women, in various ways, attempts to identify the extent and causes of physical and psychological violence against women for the purposes of uncovering the means to end it. Including issues such as rape and other forms of sexual violence against women, this research area has links to *sexuality*, which is another key focus for feminist research (see e.g. Jackson, 1993b; Kemp & Squires, 1997:316-384; Richardson, 1993).

Like many areas of research interest, sexuality embodies a multitude of specific foci and frequently overlaps with other areas mentioned in this section. Viewed as a central tenet of men and women's lives, various forms of sexual relationships, such as heterosexual, lesbian and bisexual relationships are addressed. When addressing these issues, feminist academics investigate the ways in which, whether oppressive or pleasurable, the different

power relationships that exist within and between different types of sexual relationships manifest themselves. Here, as well as investigating actual sexual relationships between people, whether, for example, in working, domestic or leisure contexts, the impact of sexuality in written texts, language and, more generally, the media, is also researched.

The *representation of women and men* both in general and as two internally heterogeneous groups is a research area that includes yet extends beyond investigations linked to sexuality (see e.g. Atkinson, 1993; Frith, 1993; Cosslett et al., 1996:79-149; Kemp & Squires, 1997:395-467; Marshment, 1993; Ryan, 1993; Young, 1993). As I have already noted, research in this area may involve analysing written texts, language or, more broadly, the media. By analysing how men and women are represented and how they interact with these representations and either adopt or resist them, studies in this area expose oppressive or empowering representations and also examine the role of representation in identity formation.

Identity is another broad issue in itself that has attracted the attention of academic feminism (see e.g. Cosslett et al., 1996:151-223; Kemp & Squires, 1997:216-315). While, obviously being an issue of interest to those with formal academic training in psychology or psychoanalysis, its attraction as a research area is by no means restricted to academic feminists with these specific disciplinary backgrounds. Addressing the formation of and changes occurring within gendered, that is masculine and feminine, identities throughout the life course, studies related to this area are not merely concerned with differences and/or similarities between two relatively homogenous identity types. Instead, studies also examine how different forms of masculinity and femininity are articulated, here taking into account interactions between gender and, for example, 'race' or ethnic background, sexuality and class to name but a few.

By looking at various aspects of women's involvement in the political arena and the effects of political systems on women's lives, academic feminism also addresses the issue of *women, politics and political activism* (see e.g. Cosslett et al., 1996:225-287; Hannam,

1993; Pearson, 1993; Ruth, 1998:481-578). Within this research area, for example, a key focus is women's collective grass roots activism to win political equality and protection. Here, studies include the analysis of women's exclusion from and struggles for the right to vote. In addition, other areas included within this research focus are the effects of various types of legislation on women, for example, legislation relating to, marriage, paid employment and abortion. Such analyses may be viewed as blurring the boundaries somewhat between this research area and another, namely, *women and law* (see e.g. Hucklesby, 1993; Power, 1993). This latter area of research interest is concerned with questions relating to women as makers, breakers, upholders and victims of the law. Analysis here includes, among other issues, addressing the extent to which women are or should be protected by gender specific laws.

Abortion, reproduction, reproductive technologies and all other aspects of women's health fall within, but by no means exhaust, the area of *science, medicine and technology* (see e.g. Ettorre, 2002; Hanmer, 1993; Hockey, 1993; Jackson et al., 1993b; Kemp & Squires, 1997:468-529). This research area is investigated in many ways and at different levels. For example, within the area of medicine and medically related science and technology, academic feminism has addressed how women as patients interact with and are affected by health services (Doyal, 1998) and medical technologies (Stanworth, 1987). Here, it is not only differences between women's and men's experiences that have been examined but also differences between the experiences of different groups of women (Hockey, 1993:250-254, 267-268). Related to the area of women and work, which was mentioned above, academic feminism has also considered women's participation in the development and provision of services within the medical professions. In so doing, it has examined, for example, the under-representation of women at the top of the medical professions and the clustering, especially of certain groups of women, in particular black women, within lower status positions in the health service (Hockey, 1993:258-262). Likewise, women as users, objects of inquiry, inventors and providers have also been considered within the area of non-medically related science and technology (see e.g. McNeil, 1987).

While already noted both earlier in the chapter and, either explicitly or implicitly, during this section, the research area of *women and 'race' and ethnicity* warrants mention here (see e.g. Bhavnani, 1993). Research related to this area includes, for example, the internal critique of the white bias of much academic feminism. Here, it is argued that much work produced within academic feminism has tended to exclude or marginalize women who are not white. Consequently, studies of various aspects of the lives of women of colour that fall within the boundaries of the other research areas I mention in this section are carried out. These studies aim to reveal and explain similarities and differences between the experiences of white women and women of colour and also between different groups of women of colour.

By no means claiming to have included all the research areas that are addressed by academic feminism, *women, girls and education* is the last issue I will highlight in this section (see e.g. Deem, 1996b; Skelton, 1993). On the one hand, studies within this research area focus on examining the different educational experiences of men and women. On the other hand, taking an organizational approach, studies also address, for example, the structuring of and cultural assumptions, rules, distribution of resources and management within education institutions to consider how these institutions become gendered spaces (Deem, 1996b:48). Issues addressed within this broad research area include, for example, examinations of tutor-student, student-student and tutor-tutor interactions and the extent to which male bias exists within textbooks. In addition, another of the many areas within this broad topic attracting research attention is the investigation of the extent to which pupils perceive certain subjects as either masculine or feminine ones and how their perceptions help to account for the subject choices they make. Focussing on tertiary as well as primary and secondary education establishments, academic feminism has also turned the spotlight on its own experiences within higher education institutions (see e.g. Christian-Smith & Kellor, 1999; Collins et al., 1998; Morley, 1999; Morely & Walsh, 1995, Roberts, 1992; Stanley, 1990b; Stanley, 1997; Stanton & Stewart, 1995). Here, studies focusing on the institutional positioning of academic feminism have addressed the experiences of feminist academics, for example, how they

feel they are treated by non-feminist colleagues and whether they believe their political leanings and gender act as barriers to promotion. In addition, academic feminism has critically examined feminist teaching practices and research methods.

My outlining of some of academic feminism's key research areas above, admittedly, represents no more than a 'whistle-stop' tour. However, as intended, by bringing research interests to the foreground in this section, I have been able demonstrate that academic feminism's substantive research interests, while focusing on analysing gender, are broad and varied.

3.4 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have carried out the first stage of research that Mannheim advocates for studies in the sociology of knowledge by primarily concentrating on mapping out a number of the key perspectives that are regarded as parts of academic feminism. The shorter perspective overviews demonstrated that the categories used to denote different types of academic feminism are diverse, yet, also, frequently, overlap. During the longer overviews of poststructuralist and materialist feminism, I clarified the key characteristics of the two perspectives that are most central to my investigations, namely, poststructuralist and historical materialist perspectives. In so doing, I prepared the ground for the second stage of my research. However, before proceeding onto the second stage of my research, which forms the focus of the next two chapters, I mapped out some of academic feminism's major substantive research interests. Consequently, my response to the question posed by this chapter, 'What is Academic Feminism?', has demonstrated that, both in its intellectual positionings and research interests, academic feminism focuses on gender yet it does so in a variety of ways.

Chapter Four: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:

Britain and the USA 1980

The question facing a concrete sociology of knowledge is the following one: what categories, what systematic conceptions are used by the different groups at a given stage in accounting for one and the same fact uncovered in the course of practical operations? And what are the tensions which arise in the attempt to fit these new facts into those categories and systematic conceptions?

(Mannheim, 1952a: 147)

4.1: Introduction

The last chapter intentionally provided a very broad, spatially and temporally unmoored overview of academic feminism. Informed by the insights of Chapter Three, my intention in Chapters Four and Five is to consider the extent to which academic feminists in Britain and the USA in 1980 and 1998 respectively, "...actually did think in these terms" (Mannheim, 1968:277). Drawing on the data from the journal and book sample, described in Chapter Two, I shall continue to remain faithful to Mannheim's methodological approach for studies in the sociology of knowledge by injecting a temporal element into the study. In so doing, I will conduct the second stage of Mannheim's methodological approach. Here, I will not only map out the general intellectual terrain that is spanned by the sample texts in each geographical and date group, but also consider the intellectual map of the sample groups in relation to the first three hypotheses guiding my research.

To achieve my aims, I will examine the sample texts for 1980 in this chapter in relation to Hypotheses One and Two. Hypothesis Three will be considered at the end of Chapter Five following my consideration of the sample texts from 1998. The methods for analysing the sample texts were outlined in detail in Chapter Two. Thus, while I do not wish to repeat these descriptions here, I will begin this chapter with a brief restatement and outline of Hypotheses One, Two and Three, which will sharpen the focus for Chapter Four and Chapter Five. In the next two main sections, 'Britain 1980' and 'USA 1980', I will provide a very brief description of every sample text that falls within the location and year

in question and consider the texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two respectively. As space constraints make it impossible to furnish a comprehensive summary of every text, the initial descriptions are deliberately written with the first two hypotheses in mind. Despite their brevity, it is hoped that these descriptions will provide at least some means for evaluating the extent to which I have taken the entire sample group into account when drawing conclusions about the first two hypotheses.

4.2: Hypotheses One, Two and Three

There is...no question of an undifferentiated 'spirit of the age' promoting or inhibiting the potentialities inherent in individual characteristics...the 'spirit of the age' is always split up into a number of tendencies rather than being now exclusively romantic, now exclusively rationalistic.

(Mannheim, 1952b: 316-317)

Hypothesis One, which is examined in Chapters Four and Five along with Hypotheses Two and Three, relates to the theoretical perspectives informing academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980 and 1998 respectively. More specifically, the first hypothesis states that during the 1980s and 1990s there has been a shift in dominance in the theoretical perspectives informing feminist academic work from those informed by historical materialism, which (as became evident in Chapter Three) exists in both Marxist and non-Marxist forms to those informed by poststructuralism. Thus, drawing on the insights of Chapter Three, the dominant emphasis in 1980 is expected to be placed upon developing or using theories that are geared towards examining social relations. These social relations are regarded as being shaped by large systems or modes of production and reproduction that are claimed to organise societies in historical contexts. Moreover, in these theories, inequalities in the distribution of power and non-discursive material resources are viewed as the result of the particular patterning of the social relations that both arise out of a given system and keep that system working. Therefore, to effect a more equitable distribution of resources and power in societies where inequalities exist, the system, or mode of production and reproduction, must be brought to a halt and

overthrown by changing the emergent social relations that keep the system going. By 1998, however, dominance is expected to have shifted towards developing or using theories where prominence is granted to exploring the internal workings of discontinuous discourses. The emphasis here is expected to be placed upon exposing how multiple and shifting discourses act to constitute particular forms of hegemonic domination, yet also provide the means for subversive resistance. As suggested by Mannheim's claims about *Weltanschauungen* in this section's opening quote and stated in my hypothesis, confirmation of Hypothesis One depends upon shifts in *dominance* in the perspectives informing the sample groups rather than the total presence or absence of particular perspectives in each sample group.

From my discussion in Chapter Three, it is evident that academic feminism has been carved up in multiple ways in attempts to classify different feminist perspectives. Moreover, I argued that often a single perspective, for example, Black, radical or lesbian feminism, encompasses works that are philosophically at odds with each other when looked at through a different lens. Ultimately, it is the view through the lens formed by Hypothesis One that is of primary concern when considering theoretical perspectives in Chapters Four and Five. It is therefore not my intention to attempt to place every text in the sample into the individual, multiple categories that I outlined in Chapter Three. Instead, I wish to focus on the key debates and themes. If it is pertinent to the task at hand I will focus on certain anomalies or outstanding features in individual texts that emerge as a result of looking through the specific lens formed by Hypothesis One. Nevertheless, to illuminate some of the theoretical debates, tensions and developments that help to clarify this view, reference will be made to some of the different types of feminism that were outlined in Chapter Three.

Hypothesis Two is more concerned with the specific content and focus of the sample texts. Here, material issues, for example, concrete social or economic issues, are expected to be most dominant in the 1980 texts while cultural issues, for example, in the form of language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, are expected to be most

dominant in 1998. Additionally in 1980, both women's oppression and action to end it are expected to be described in a manner that suggests they are collective issues. However, the emphasis in 1998 is expected to have slipped towards understanding the different forms of oppression that are experienced by particular women and their individual responses to it, which Ebert (1996) argues represents an individualist outlook. Finally, Hypothesis Three, which will be considered at the end of Chapter Five, suggests that shifts detected in the content and focus of academic feminism in Britain and the USA are related to shifts in the dominant theoretical perspectives.

4.3: The 1980 British Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two

In this section I will focus on the 1980 British sample texts. I will begin with a brief description of each text falling into the sample. Following this, I will consider the texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two respectively.

4.31: Descriptions

The qualifying texts for the 1980 British sample totalled thirty-two journal contributions and ten books. Of the journal contributions, eighteen were from issues of *Feminist Review* and fourteen were from *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. Of the book sample, seven were single author books, one was a joint authored book, one was a book with one editor and one was a joint-edited book. The bibliographic details for these texts appear in Appendix I. To allow for comparisons to be made between the different journals under consideration and the book sample I will begin by describing the content of each separately.

4.311: Feminist Review

In contrast to the majority of the British texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, which I will reflect on in section 4.312, what I believe stands out most in the eighteen texts in *Feminist Review* is that, for at least the majority of the authors, Marx matters. In some texts, this concern with Marx is quite simply evident in the way the authors critically reflect on their chosen issue. For example, Marx's influence is evident in Coyle (1980) and Cousins' (1980) attacks on proposals to remove protective legislation for women working in factories. This influence can also be detected in Lovell's (1980) claims, which receive a positive introduction from Wolpe (1980), that mature women's access to education is regulated by the pressures of labour force needs as well as patriarchal relations in the family.

What is clear from several texts, when looked at collectively, is that whilst the authors seem to want Marx to figure in some way in analyses of women's oppression, they have not reached agreement upon how. Himmelweit's (1980) critical reflection on the limitations of single issue campaigns, such as the ongoing abortion campaign, highlights the existing need for a theory to explain the false divide between production and reproduction. In addition, the continued need for more adequate hybrids of Marxism and feminism features in Stacey and Price's (1980) analysis of women's under-representation in politics and Campbell's (1980) account of the failure of heterosexual feminists to seriously analyse their positions in capitalist systems.

When considering existing theoretical approaches in books by Byrne (1978) and Deem (1978) that analyse girls' experiences in education, Nava (1980) endorses the socialist approach of one book over the liberal approach of the other. Yet she is critical of Deem's (1978) socialist feminist unified analysis for failing to treat patriarchy as a separate system from capitalism. Exploring how dominant conceptualisations of skill in paid labour persistently act to disadvantage women workers, Phillips and Taylor (1980) also endorse a dual systems approach, which is advocated here as two separate, but interlocking, historical materialist systems. However, in Yuval-Davis' analyses of religious legislation in

Israel (1980) and Land's (1980) concept of the family wage, the ideological construction of women within Marxist modes of production is emphasised in order to show how it legitimises women's position as reproducers of labour and their economic dependence on men. This focus on ideology is viewed positively by Kaluzynska (1980) who regards it as a solution to the impasse reached in the increasing intellectualisation of the domestic labour debates that occurred during the 1970s along with a radical to Marxist feminist shift in emphasis.

Ideology continues to remain an important feature in Steedman's (1980) and Coward's (1980) articles. Yet, despite their differences, what seems to distinguish these two texts from all of those already mentioned is their apparent slippage from a concern with large, relatively internally undifferentiated systems that act upon men and women, causing them, in turn, to act in certain ways. In Steedman's (1980) article, the ongoing reflective, discursive processes of writing and talking with peers is explored to consider how the psychological development of working class schoolgirls in particular historical contexts is delicately negotiated by the girls rather than simply imposed from above. In contrast, the discursive interpellation of women into particular subject positions, stressed by Coward (1980) in her critical reflections on novels by women, appears to return to the concerns of the texts in *Feminist Review* mentioned earlier. However, the multiplicity of women's subject positions stressed in Coward's (1980) article begins to distinguish her approach from that which is evident in these texts. Moreover, her view of historical contexts, which appear to be largely described in terms of the congealing of discursive practices rather than concrete material settings, distances her from other texts even further. Yet what does unite Coward's (1980) text to at least four others in *Feminist Review* is its concern with questions related to political unity.

Given her stress on the multiple ways in which women are interpellated by discourses, Coward (1980) calls for feminist politics to be based not upon common experiences but rather upon a unity of political interests, presumably against oppression *per se*, arising out of differences among women. Stated in these terms, her argument begins to sound not

unlike those for radical democracy that were advanced later by Laclau and Mouffe (1985). Here socialist politics is regarded as being based upon the equivalence of difference between various oppressions. Keeping the focus on unity within the feminist movement, Caesar (1980) explores Italian feminism in order to encourage British feminists to look outwards and forge links with feminists in the rest of Europe.

In the remaining three texts in *Feminist Review*, which provide critical reflections on the recent pamphlet, subsequently published as a book, *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism & The Making of Socialism* (Rowbotham, Segal & Wainwright, 1979), it is questions of unity between feminism and the socialist movement that are under the spotlight. Thus, in these texts, the dominant theme arising out of *Feminist Review*, namely, that Marx matters, is again visible. Collectively, Margolis (1980), Phillips (1980) and Wilson (1980a) reveal tensions both within and between socialism and feminism. Moreover, in Wilson's (1980a) article it is evident that these tensions were beginning to result in a turning away from Marx by some socialist feminists, in particular those publishing in the journal *m/f*¹, to focus on theories associated with poststructuralism. This turning away from Marx is criticised by Wilson (1980a) and stands out in contrast to the approaches taken by the majority of authors in *Feminist Review* who, despite their differences, clearly are trying to figure out how to use Marx in analyses of women's oppression.

4.312: Women's Studies International Quarterly

One text from the fourteen qualifying for the 1980 British sample from *Women's Studies International Quarterly* was published in the double special issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* and seven were published in the special issue on *Women and Media*. Despite being written by women based in the same country, I believe that the picture of the world or *Weltanschauung* emerging out of the texts in this journal seems

¹ The feminist journal *m/f* was a British feminist journal that began publication in 1978. Since publication ceased in 1986 (Landry & MacLean, 1993:32) it did not satisfy the criteria set for selecting journals. The journal itself was a product of the Marxism/feminism struggles and represented a shift towards poststructuralist interpretations of Lacan and work on discursive practices in an effort to resolve the struggles. Attacks on this shift were being made in 1980 not only by socialist feminists wanting to retain a focus on Marxist forms of historical materialism (e.g.

very different from that which seems to be constructed by the majority of 1980 British texts in *Feminist Review*. Certainly, the qualifying texts in both journals are linked by their general concerns with women and feminism. However, the dominance of socialist feminists ideas and their concerns with Marx and feminist links with the socialist movement that is evident in *Feminist Review* is replaced here with a seemingly much more radical feminist concern with men and sexist values and norms in which Marxist modes of production and reproduction remain relatively absent.

Of course, it would be wrong to say that none of the texts take Marxist forms of historical materialism into account. Allen (1980), for example, challenging the reduction of ethnic difference and, consequently, South Asian women's oppression to cultural difference, calls for historically contextualised analyses focusing on concrete social relations within the local labour force and the family. In so doing, she stands out not only for her concern with matters seemingly influenced by both Marxist and non-Marxist forms of historical materialism but also for her specific focus on non-white women. In addition, viewing ideology as rising out of a Marxist form of economic system, Leman's (1980) article in the special issue on *Women and Media* shows how women's magazines act to endorse women's positions as reproducers of labour power and a reserve army of labour. Ettorre's (1980) article, which explores a particular form of politicised lesbianism, labelled social lesbianism, also has traces of Marx's approach with its references to capitalism. Yet the author's emphasis seems to slip onto the role of men rather capitalism in the production of social norms and attitudes that shape and legitimise women's oppression. Consequently, this links her concerns to those that are dominant in this journal.

I would suggest, therefore, that exposing, understanding and attacking the single system of patriarchy is the key theme uniting the majority of the remaining texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. However, answers to just what this means and how it is achieved are not uniform. In the special issue on *Women and Media*, Dalton's (1980)

account of her experiences as a feminist artist has a separatist flavour, stressing the distinctiveness and potential power of women's creativity. Nevertheless, Tammes' (1980) reflections on her experiences as a camerawoman urge women to recognise their ability to participate with men in the creation of culture in order to change it. Straddling the arguments of both of these texts, Karpf's (1980) exploration of women and radio calls for both separatism *and* working with men as means to transform sexist values and attitudes.

It is questions of separatism and mixing with men that form the basis of Freeman and Jones' (1980) reflection on liberal and revolutionary feminists' arguments about whether women's studies courses should be open to men. Yet while Freeman and Jones (1980) conclude that, for the time being at least, a women only environment is desirable if any women in particular groups oppose the presence of men, Gordon and Kay (1980) openly criticise the formation of a women only workshop in their report on a feminist film event. The explicit evidence of poststructuralist tendencies in Gordon and Kay's (1980) text appears to single it out from all the other 1980 British texts in this journal. Here, one finds a positive endorsement of notions such as the split rather than unified subject and of *m/f*, the journal that Wilson (1980a) criticises in *Feminist Review* for its poststructuralist tendencies.

Indeed, in the special issue on the *Voices and Words of Women and Men*, Bruner and Kelso (1980), influenced by the structuralist approach of Roland Barthes, emphasise differences between rather than within men and women's communication patterns in toilet graffiti. Injecting history and returning to a focus on the media, Baehr (1980) and Booth (1980) critically examine how television programmes, as transmitters of patriarchal values, attempt to respond and 'correct' changing social situations in specific historical contexts that might threaten the continuation of patriarchal social relations.

The impact of dominant sexist attitudes and values continues to be criticised by Litman (1980), for the way sex-role stereotyping impacts specifically on women alcoholics but also on women more generally, and Walters (1980), who reflects on the poor reception of

Elizabeth Gaskell's writings by male critics. Likewise, the historicised psychoanalytic approach of Evans (1980a) highlights the infiltration of sexist attitudes into the work of Simone de Beauvoir in the form of a devaluing of traits traditionally labelled as 'feminine'. Yet unlike Dalton (1980), who seems to argue for an elevation of feminine traits above masculine ones, Evans (1980a) argues more for a re-evaluation that places feminine traits on the same level as masculine ones and an acknowledgement that all of these traits are expressions of humanness.

4.313: Books

The dominant themes in terms of perspectives and also some of the concerns in terms of specific issues detected in the sample texts from both of the journals are evident within the ten books in the 1980 British sample. In addition, but to a lesser extent, both liberal feminist and poststructuralist tendencies appear to be present.

The view that Marx matters, which was evident in at least the majority of texts in *Feminist Review* and some of those in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, can be also be distinguished in a number of the books. However, as I suggested when discussing the texts in *Feminist Review*, there is evidence here of disagreement about exactly how Marx should matter. Calling for greater unity between feminism and the socialist movement during her reflections on feminist politics, Paczuscka (1980) attacks both radical feminism and dual systems socialist feminist approaches. In Wilson's (1980b) analysis of the ideological construction of women in the postwar period in Britain, the arguments made in her article in *Feminist Review* (Wilson, 1980a) are repeated. Thus, here, she highlights the need for more adequate mixings of feminism and Marxism at the theoretical level, she reflects on feminism's relationship to the socialist movement and attacks the growth of tendencies that can be labelled here as poststructuralist appearing within socialist feminism. In the chapters by British based authors that Malos (1980) selected for her book addressing the domestic labour debates there are differences in opinions between and among Marxist and socialist feminists about the relationship of feminism to the socialist movement generally as well as the specific issue of housework.

Keeping a focus on the domestic realm, key concerns for Lowry (1980), who locates women's oppression in the systemic separation of production and reproduction, are housework, housewives and the need for greater economic independence for women. Yet Leonard has a more radical feminist approach to using Marx than the more broadly socialist and Marxist approaches mentioned already (1980a). She employs Christine Delphy's non-Marxist historical materialist theoretical framework during her examination of the symbolism arising out of rituals associated with courtship and marriage. While granted space within *Feminist Review* in 1980 (Delphy, 1980), but do not qualify for the sample due to the author's location, Delphy's views are explicitly criticised by the editors of *Feminist Review*.

Birke et al.'s (1980) text keeps links to Marx by explicitly labelling authors as socialist feminists. However, when addressing the role of science in the system of patriarchy, the entries selected for this text appear on the whole, although, not exclusively, to have a distinctively radical feminist flavour. A major concern of the entries in Birke et al.'s (1980) text is to emphasise how the authority of science enables it to legitimise the exploitation of women's bodies and sexist definitions of women more generally in society. In contrast, and in line with the focus of a number of texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, it is the exposure of general sexist ideas, particularly in the media and popular culture, that forms the central concern of Adams and Laurikietis' (1980) text.

Rather than exposing sexism in ideas about women in order to criticise them, a central aim of the one book in the sample focussing specifically on non-white women is to encourage Western respect for Islamic ideas in general (Waddy, 1980). During her descriptions of women in Muslim history, Waddy (1980) appears to endorse the notion that women should be regarded as different from, yet still equal to men because of women's roles as mothers and carers. She claims that this notion of 'different but equal' is a key feature in Islamic ideas. Thus, Waddy's text appears to share the liberal 'equality in difference' perspective that Wilson (1980a), in *Feminist Review*, attributes to Britain (1980). The latter's sample text, first published in 1957, provides an autobiographical

account of her life between 1925 and 1950. Finally, again taking a historical approach but focussing specifically on girls' access to education in Britain, Fletcher (1980) aims to show how the success of an Act of Parliament is not determined by the Act itself but rather by the ideas about women that are held by those who are charged with its implementation.

4.32: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives

According to Hypothesis One, the dominant theoretical perspectives circulating within the 1980 British texts are expected to be historical materialist in either Marxist or non-Marxist forms. This contrasts with the expected results for 1998 when poststructuralist perspectives should be dominant. In this sub-section, I will argue that there is evidence to suggest that historical materialist perspectives do appear to be more dominant within the 1980 British texts than poststructuralist perspectives. However, I will also suggest that in a number of texts, while it is possible to identify tendencies towards a 'type' of feminism, it is difficult to establish exactly where the philosophical base underlying the arguments is. Therefore, I will conclude that whether historical materialist perspectives were actually dominant in academic feminism in Britain in 1980 remains open to question.

In my reflections on the two journals for Britain 1980 I suggested that the qualifying texts appear to fall generally, although, not exclusively, within two 'camps'. Yet, in so doing, it is important to emphasise that I have not argued that the philosophical underpinnings of each 'camp' are necessarily internally homogenous or always entirely unrelated to each other. Thus, on the one hand, the most dominant *Weltanschauung* that is guiding and advocated by the authors in *Feminist Review* appears to be one that can be labelled as, broadly, socialist feminism. On the other hand, the most dominant *Weltanschauung* that is guiding and advocated by the authors in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* appears to be one that can be labelled as, broadly, radical feminism.

Despite differences and tensions among and within accounts tending towards either radical or socialist feminism, the authors in each journal do, on the whole, tend to talk in terms of large, relatively internally undifferentiated systems that intend to shape women in a manner that will cause them to act in a particular way. Consequently, the majority of texts in these journals do not appear to be exhibiting tendencies that would be associated with poststructuralism. Nevertheless, with some notable exceptions (e.g. Allen, 1980; Baehr, 1980; Booth, 1980; Leman, 1980), in a number of the texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* the system determining women's oppression seems to be largely described in terms of values or norms without reference to any base that is material in a Marxist or non-Marxist historical materialist sense. Thus, it is fair to say that many of these texts do leave one wondering where the external base for these values and norms actually is, if, indeed, there is one, and, if so, one that is not essentialist? Yet, given that the authors do seem to be exposing sexist norms and values in order to urge responses that will change them, it would seem that essentialism is not necessarily a view that they adhere to.

In the book sample it does appear that the dominant perspective is historical materialism, which is manifested in the texts in Marxist and non-Marxist forms. In addition, during my descriptions above, I have shown that both of the dominant tendencies in the journal sample towards socialist and radical feminism can be identified in the books. Again, here, the dominant tendency is for authors to be advocating large, relatively internally undifferentiated systems that intend to shape women in a manner that will cause them to act in particular ways.

Nevertheless, from the sample as a whole it is clear that differences exist among texts that might be regarded as tending towards either socialist feminism or radical feminism. Indeed, in light of my descriptions of various perspectives in Chapter Three, it is evident from the sample not only that socialist feminism is struggling for more adequate mixings of Marxism and feminism, but also that differences exist between those advocating unified

and dual systems approaches (e.g. Nava, 1980; Paczuscka, 1980; Phillips & Taylor, 1980).

In addition, in the more radical feminist oriented texts there are individual texts with tendencies towards lesbian feminism, which, perhaps, also include traces of standpoint feminism (e.g. Ettorre, 1980) and different forms of cultural feminism (e.g. Dalton, 1980; Evans, 1980a). Psychoanalytic feminism can be identified as a positive influence in some of the texts (e.g. Steedman, 1980; Evans, 1980a; Gordon & Kay, 1980). Likewise, both journals also do contain at least some reference to liberal feminism, Nava (1980) in *Feminist Review* and Freeman and Jones (1980) in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. These liberal views appear to be evident within the books, albeit in a fashion that suggests they include hints of a mixing with cultural feminist ideas (e.g. Waddy, 1980; Brittain, 1980). Furthermore, while regarded in the texts concerned as an under-researched area, the attention granted specifically to non-white women in one of the texts (Allen, 1980) and women more generally in non-Western contexts in another (Waddy, 1980) seems to show some desire to mix in the types of concerns that are identifiable in Black feminism.

Importantly, in relation to Hypothesis One, while not a view that could be claimed to be dominant within the journals chosen for the sample or among the books, the sample contains evidence that poststructuralist tendencies were at least beginning to circulate within feminism in Britain in 1980. In *Feminist Review*, for example, these tendencies are attacked by Wilson (1980a) but actually appear to be influencing Steedman (1980) and Coward (1980) to some extent. Likewise, Gordon and Kay (1980) seem to take a positive view of what could be labelled poststructuralist forms of analysis, the approaches that Wilson (1980b) criticises again in the book sample. Importantly, references made by Wilson (1980a) to views that can be labelled here as poststructuralist that were circulating within the journal *m/f* does raise questions about whether, if included in the sample, the texts from this journal might alter my final conclusions about Hypothesis One. However, only one issue of *m/f* was published in 1980 and this issue only contained four texts that

would have qualified for the sample. Therefore, while *m/f*'s inclusion might have further highlighted some of the tensions within socialist feminism in 1980, I do not believe it would have altered the final conclusions I draw from the sample as a whole.

Many of the different perspectives that I outlined in Chapter Three are evident within the texts in the 1980 British sample. I hope that I have also shown that these perspectives are often mixed with each other in single texts. Yet, overall, there is evidence to suggest that more texts in the British 1980 sample group are influenced, at least to some extent, by historical materialist perspectives than by poststructuralist perspectives. Indeed, historical materialist perspectives collectively in Marxist and non-Marxist forms appear to be the most dominant perspectives both in *Feminist Review* and among the books. In addition, there is evidence of historical materialism in at least some of the texts from *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. I also believe it is evident that the influence of Marxist forms of historical materialism is more dominant than non-Marxist forms. Nevertheless, it is clear that there are tensions about the way and the extent to which historical materialism can or should be employed in analyses of women's oppression. Additionally there are a number of texts in the sample that do not make clear reference to a material base that could be regarded as historical materialist. It is, therefore, difficult to reach a firm conclusion about whether, or the extent to which, historical materialism was actually the dominant perspective influencing academic feminism in Britain in 1980.

4.33: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts

According to the second hypothesis, the content of the 1980 British texts is expected to be more oriented towards addressing concrete material social and economic issues rather than cultural issues such as those pertaining to language, representation, symbolisation and discourse. In addition, women's oppression is expected to be described and analysed more as a collective issue requiring collective responses to end it rather than seeking ways to understand and analyse the oppression of individual women and their personal

responses to it. In this sub-section, I will argue that, while the second aspect of Hypothesis Two is confirmed in the British 1980 sample, it is prudent to reserve judgement on the first.

Whether the distinction between a focus on material issues rather than cultural issues is quite as clear cut as Barrett's (1992) arguments tend to suggest is, I believe, thrown into question by the 1980 British texts in *Feminist Review*. Indeed, what I hope to show here is that what appears to be dominant does depend very much on how the texts are read. Contrary to what would be expected, from my descriptions of the texts in this journal it is clear that a large number of the texts *are* concerned with issues that, in themselves, might not be labelled as material issues.

On the one hand, as I already have shown, a dominant theme emerging out of a number of the texts is a concern with theory. In addition, the specific issues under debate in a number of texts are those that might be regarded as not material. These issues include, for example, *legislation*, whether related to employment (Cousins, 1980; Coyle, 1980), religion (Yuval-Davis, 1980) or abortion (Himmelweit, 1980); *education* (Nava, 1980; Wolpe, 1980; Lovell, 1980); the *concept* of the family wage (Land, 1980); *conceptualisations* of skill (Phillips & Taylor, 1980); *novels* by women and the *discursive* interpellation of women into subject positions (Coward, 1980) and the *linguistic* negotiation of identity through conversation and writing (Steedman, 1980).

On the other hand, with the exception of Coward's (1980) text, and also, perhaps, less evident in Steedman's text (1980), what does seem to link the individual texts just mentioned *is* a material issue. This link is their general understanding of the seemingly non-material specific issues addressed as arising out of and legitimising women's relationship to paid and unpaid labour and reproduction. In addition, as I argued when reflecting on Hypothesis One, the dominant concern with theory *is* about how to use historical materialist insights to explain women's oppression. Consequently, I believe that the primary concerns of at least a greater number of the texts are material. The specific

issues addressed, many of which I believe are cultural, appear to be secondary concerns in as much as they are regarded as being shaped by material concerns.

Although less evident in Steeman's (1980) article, which tends to stress differences among girls in identity construction, the majority of authors in *Feminist Review* approach the subject of women's oppression and the means to end it, as a collective issue. Throughout the journal a key concern is with the different relationship women and men have to the means of production and reproduction rather than differences among women and the multiple, often conflicting, identities of individual women or differences among men and the multiple, often conflicting, identities of individual men. Even Campbell (1980), for example, who addresses heterosexual women, sets her arguments more broadly within the general context of inequalities between men and women.

With regard to political action, I have shown that political unity is a thorny issue, particularly in the form of the relationship of feminism to the socialist movement (Margolis, 1980, Phillips, 1980, Wilson, 1980a). Nevertheless, here, the belief that action against women's oppression requires a collective effort is not disputed. In addition, even Coward's (1980) text, which does stress differences among women, contains evidence of a desire to seek political unity on some level, thereby suggesting that the author is committed to collective forms of political action.

With three of the four 1980 issues of *Women's Studies International Quarterly* being devoted to special issues on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* – (a double special issue) – and *Women and Media* it is unsurprising that, contrary to the results expected for Hypothesis Two, cultural concerns dominate. Nevertheless, it is important to note that, while seven texts from the fourteen qualifying for the 1980 British sample from this journal are in the special issue on *Women and Media*, only one text is in the double special issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men*. Yet all of the texts in the journal appear to be concerned with cultural issues in some way. For Allen (1980), who argues against the reduction of ethnic difference to culture, the concern with the non-

material is, admittedly, in a negative sense. In Leman's (1980) text it is the linking of the discursive issue in question to women's relationship to the means of production and reproduction (viewing it as both an effect and endorser of this relationship) that is crucial. This was also evident in a number of the texts in *Feminist Review*. Certainly, Baehr (1980) and Booth (1980) make reference to the shaping of media content by social relations in the broader patriarchal historical context. In addition, a number of authors, for example, Tammes (1980), Dalton (1980), Karpf (1980), Ettore (1980) and Walters (1980) link the general 'problem' of sexism in dominant ideas back to women's lack of participation in their production. Yet, as I have pointed out in the previous section, the dominant key concern linking the majority of the texts in this journal regardless of their specific focus is the exploration of sexist norms, stereotypes and values.

On the whole, I believe that the texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* tend to share a collectivist orientation. Allen (1980) does, admittedly, stand out for her specific concern with South Asian women and Gordon and Kay (1980) make reference to a concern among film theorists to problematize the concept of the unitary woman. Yet, overall, there is a dominant tendency to talk about women as a group, which, in a manner that is similar to the texts in *Feminist Review*, emphasises difference between men and women rather than within each category. Even Litman (1980) and Ettore (1980), who, like Allen (1980), are concerned with particular groups of women, link their arguments back to a larger, more general context in which the vital element is difference between women and men.

The book sample includes tendencies towards both material and cultural issues. I would argue that the discursive concern with theory that seems to arise out of *Feminist Review* also arises out of the book sample. This concern is particularly evident in at least the majority of the books that I suggested demonstrate evidence of the fact that Marx matters to their authors or editors (e.g. Lowry, 1980; Birke et al.; 1980, Leonard, 1980a; Malos, 1980; Paczuscka, 1980; Wilson, 1980b). Nevertheless, in line with my comments about the theoretical concerns in *Feminist Review*, the dominant concern here appears to be

with promoting and developing theory that explains women's oppression in terms of their relationship to production and reproduction. However, in these books, the concern is articulated in both Marxist and non-Marxist historical materialist terms.

Specific issues addressed within the texts just mentioned above can be regarded as cultural and material. Explorations, for example, of ideology, symbolism and sexist definitions of women form some of the more cultural central concerns of these texts (e.g. Birke et al., 1980; Leonard, 1980a; Lowry, 1980; Wilson, 1980b). Yet texts also include material concerns, for example, in the form, of analyses of paid and unpaid labour (e.g. Paczuska, 1980; Leonard, 1980a; Lowry, 1980; Malos, 1980). In the remaining texts, cultural issues, for example, in the form of sexist ideas (e.g. Adams & Laurikietis, 1980) religion (e.g. Waddy, 1980) and an Act of Parliament relating to education (e.g. Fletcher, 1980; Waddy, 1980), as well as material issues, for example, in the form of concrete lived experience (e.g. Brittain, 1980) and women's employment (Waddy, 1980), are treated as key concerns. Although, less evident in Adams and Laurikietis' (1980) book, by actually addressing multiple issues during the course of their particular analyses what is revealed in the majority of these remaining texts is a mixing of concerns that are both material and cultural.

Despite differences in their particular foci, what I believe arises again from the book sample is that women's oppression and the action required to end it are collective rather than individual issues. Whether investigating the concrete lived experiences of women or depictions of women, it is women as members of a relatively homogeneous group who mostly tend to be discussed. Waddy's (1980) book does stand out because of its specific focus on women in Muslim contexts and its calls for Western respect for non-Western cultures. However, the author's concern with women's general role as reproducers seems to orient her towards a view that reduces differences among women and stresses their collective difference from men. In addition, even in Brittain's (1980) autobiographical text it is made explicit that the author's intention is to show how her own experiences as a woman are not unique.

Overall, what I have revealed within my reflections on my reading of the British 1980 sample are my doubts about whether there is in fact a greater concern with issues that are material rather than with cultural issues. However, it would seem that the second aspect of Hypothesis Two has been confirmed - the orientation of the 1980 British texts does appear to be more collectivist than individualist.

4.4: The 1980 USA Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two

In this section, I will focus on the 1980 USA sample texts. I will begin with a brief description of each text falling in the sample. Following this, I will consider the texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two respectively.

4.41: Descriptions

The qualifying texts for the USA in 1980 totalled seventy-seven journal contributions and ten books. Of the journal contributions, fourteen were from *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, twenty-eight were from *Feminist Studies* and thirty-five were from *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Of the book sample, six were single author books, one was a joint authored book, one was a book with one editor and two were joint-edited books. The bibliographic details for these texts appear in Appendix II. To allow for comparisons to be made between the different journals under consideration and the book sample I will begin by describing the content of each separately.

4.411: *Women's Studies International Quarterly*

Three of the fourteen qualifying texts for the USA sample from *Women's Studies International Quarterly* were published in the special issue on *Women and Media* and nine were published in the double special issue, *The Voices and Words of Women and Men*. It is, therefore, unsurprising that the dominant linking theme of the USA texts in this journal bears similarities to that of the British texts within in it because the great majority of the

texts are to some extent concerned with representation and ideas. However, more of the USA texts were published in the double special issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* when compared to the British sample. Additionally, the USA texts in the special issue on *Women and Media* collectively have more of a socialist feminist feel than the British texts in this issue have collectively.

In the special issue on *Women and Media*, Eddings (1980) examines the rise in the numbers of women in broadcast journalism in the USA during the 1970s, yet exposes their lack of penetration into senior positions and is pessimistic about the future of affirmative action policies in light of recent moves towards the deregulation of the media. Examining media depictions of working women in one magazine, Glazer (1980) exposes how these depictions endorse working women's double-day of paid and unpaid work, encourage individual solutions to the burden the double-day places upon women and mystify the social sources of women's oppression. Finally, focussing on Latin American fotonovelas, Flora (1980) links trends in the depiction of working class and middle class women during the 1960s and 1970s to changes in the material and cultural contexts of their production.

Both of the texts not included in either of the special issues also keep some links to the economic in their analyses. Bearing similarities to the socialist arguments of Himmelweit (1980), which appeared in the 1980 British texts in *Feminist Review*, Humphries (1980) cautions against single issue campaigns for the liberalisation of abortion laws that do not take account of how access is determined by the socio-economic conditions of women. Anthony's (1980) paper stands out from the majority of the USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* due to the author's sustained focus on both racism and sexism and specifically for its criticism of the white male power structure. In this article, the author adopts a seemingly psycho-social approach to explore similarities and differences between institutionalised racism and sexism within the socio-economic context of the USA and proposes material and attitudinal changes at individual and collective levels.

In the remaining texts in the 1980 USA sample in this journal the, at least, partial concern with economics, evident within the analyses mentioned above, is relatively absent. In addition, since all of these texts were in the double special issue their collective concern with the role and importance of language is unsurprising. Wolfe and Stanley's (1980) article exhibits characteristics that indicate cultural feminist influences. The authors aim to criticise the patriarchal bias in linguistics by demonstrating that anomalies in reconstructions of Indo-European vocabulary suggest that these cultures were matriarchal rather than patriarchal. In Hoagland's (1980) text, it is the androcentric language of sociobiology that is attacked for legitimising essentialist explanations of sexual difference and hierarchy.

Continuing to aim to effect an understanding of the power of language to define hierarchical differences between the sexes, Blaubergs (1980) and Silveria (1980) focus specifically on the sexism that they claim is inherent in masculine generics. These authors respectively critically examine classic arguments against changing male generics for gender neutral terms and emphasise the differences between the way men and women use and experience them. Broadening the focus onto speech in general rather than male generics in particular, Grief (1980) and Engle (1980) investigate how gender roles and gendered speech patterns are learned by young children during linguistic interactions with their parents. Indeed, the need to discover ways to encourage the re-learning of gendered speech patterns is highlighted by Scott (1980), whose findings from a Language Stereotype Questionnaire suggest, contrary to existing research, that female language traits are often viewed more favourably than male traits when they are decontextualised from social settings. Yet for Martyna (1980a), who describes the course materials that she designed to help students explore and critically reflect on the power of gendered language, practical ways to effect the re-learning of language use are the central concerns.

Finally, the remaining article in this journal in the USA 1980 sample provides a close reading of Virginia Woolf's text, *A Room of One's Own*. Here, Salem (1980) suggests that,

by failing to explicitly name men as the oppressor of women, Woolf's text is sub-consciously constrained by the dominant views circulating when it was written and not as radical as it is often claimed to be.

4.412: Feminist Studies

With some exceptions and despite differences in particular approaches, a key concern of the USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* seems to be differences between women and men rather than differences among women and among men. As such, this concern is not unlike a key concern of the majority of the texts in the 1980 British sample as a whole. While it will be clear that exceptions exist among the 1980 USA texts in *Feminist Studies*, I believe that for the majority of the twenty-eight qualifying texts in this journal it is differences between men and women and also tensions about how to analyse these differences that are apparent as key concerns.

In a number of the texts in this journal there is evidence of the theme that I highlighted in the 1980 British *Feminist Review* texts and book sample and is visible in some of the 1980 USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, namely, that Marx matters. Yet, as in the 1980 British sample, there is evidence to suggest that differences exist about how to use Marx and to what extent.

Thus, taking issue with dominant mainstream theories of state formation, Rhorlich (1980) aims to show that state origins reside in multiple factors, including the emergence of class and patriarchy, rather than simply population pressures. Dijkstra (1980) uses Marx in a seemingly relatively faithful form to show how economic conditions in the USA prepared the ground for the acceptance of Betty Friedan's 'boiled down' version of Simone de Beauvoir's views. Felstiner's (1980) article is likewise concerned with Simone de Beauvoir's work. Yet, differing in emphasis from Dijkstra (1980), Felstiner shows how recent socialist feminist, unified and dual systems theorists were attempting to develop Marx further for feminist ends than de Beauvoir did.

Differences between socialist feminist approaches and trends within women's history are highlighted in Stansell's (1980) review of two recent women's history texts by Liddington and Norris (1978) and DuBois (1978). In addition, in Van Allen's (1980) and Kenedy and Lapidus' (1980) respective review essays of texts by Weinbaum (1978) and Eisenstein (1979) the unfinished project of socialist feminism, articulated in terms of developing a socialist feminist theory of patriarchy and a satisfactory synthesis of Marxism and radical feminism, is emphasised.

A concern with socialist feminists' lack of attention to the specific experiences of non-white women slips in to Kenedy and Lapidus' (1980) review. Yet, albeit in only four texts, attempts to integrate 'race' into socialist feminist concerns with class and gender oppression are apparent in *Feminist Studies*. Glenn (1980) stresses social relations within the workplace and the home through exploring the oppression of Japanese-American women between 1905 and 1940. Focussing on feminist research approaches and, perhaps, bearing similarities to the Black feminist standpoint approach articulated later by Collins (1991), Hull (1980) outlines the principles underlying her class-conscious 'Black feminist critical approach'. Vance (1980) is influenced by dual systems approaches that attempt to work with Marx and Freud. Writing against mainstream liberal approaches to sex research, she calls for sexuality to be viewed as structured and constrained by material and ideological systems rather than being seen simply as a matter for individual choice. Finally, forming part of a symposium on trends in women's history, Kaplan (1980) is critical of feminist historians who do not locate their accounts of women's experiences within the broader historical contexts of 'race', class and gender oppression.

The symposium that Kaplan's (1980) text forms a part of reveals a debate within women's history about a growing interest in studying and celebrating women's culture and women's relationships with each other, revealing a tendency that appears to be influenced by cultural feminism. This growing trend is introduced by Walkowitz (1980a) and endorsed by both Smith-Rosenberg (1980) and Buhle (1980). However, it is attacked by Dubois (1980), Kaplan (1980) and Lerner (1980) who claim it is ahistorical, due to its lack of attention to

the way social, economic and political systems structure specific historical contexts, and that it, therefore, detracts attention away from analysing women's oppression within these broader contexts.

The type of feminism that is associated with cultural feminism and appears to be debated within the symposium also seems to be evident, albeit in different ways and to varying degrees, in some of the other texts in this journal. This approach appears to manifest itself in Ruddick's (1980) account of 'maternal thinking', which is celebrated as a specific form of thinking that arises out the caring work primarily associated with mothering, although the author claims that it can also arise out of other forms of caring work. Diehl's (1980) review essay endorses Adrienne Rich's (1978) calls for a unified language among women that celebrates womankind. In addition, while, admittedly, arguing for pluralism in approaches to feminist literary criticism, Kolodny (1980) shows how trends in this discipline in the late 1970s have moved towards seemingly Lacanian influenced forms of psychoanalytic approaches that explore the gendered nature of symbolic action.

Stressing the importance of relationships between women in her analysis of women's daily work from 1650 to 1750 in northern New England, Ulrich (1980) challenges accepted views of the family as a self-sufficient unit in this period. Yet, in contrast, for Clawson (1980), who aims to show how patriarchal kinship relations in the family informed and were re-enforced by social relations in early modern fraternal associations, it is relationships between men that are highlighted.

With the exception of Ladimer (1980), who explores the association of women with madness and the irrational in French surrealist writing, all of the remaining texts in *Feminist Studies* are linked by the concern they share (along with Vance (1980) mentioned above) with sexuality. In four of these texts lesbianism is under the spotlight. Cook's (1980) review essay attacks a recent book by Doris Faber (1980) on Lorena Hickok that had become popular among feminists. Here, Cook (1980) claims that the book promotes oppressive stereotypes and fails to acknowledge any aspect of the subject's life

outside of her sexual relationships. Viewed as contributing to the process of uncovering lesbian history, excerpts from Gidlow's (1980) autobiographical account of her life experiences are introduced by Rapp (1980). Finally, regarding sexuality as a product of social relations rather than innate, Ramas (1980) attacks the patriarchal bias in psychoanalysis through her reading of Freud's account of Dora's hysteria. For Ramas (1980), Ida Bauer (Dora) was not simply a lesbian; instead, she repudiated the oppressive sexual relations between men and women that give heterosexuality its meaning.

Both psychoanalysis and heterosexuality appear to inform the concerns of two of the remaining texts in this journal. With the author locating her own heterosexual desire in her early childhood experiences and her relationship with her father, Lazzarre's (1980a) autobiographical account calls for sustained feminist attention to be paid to heterosexuality. Drawing on object-relations theory, Benjamin (1980) explores the violence of sadomasochism. Finally, Fuchs (1980) returns to the topic of Dijkstra (1980) and Felstiner's (1980) articles, namely, Simone de Beauvoir's work. Here, the author criticises the lack of an anti-essentialist explanation of female eroticism within de Beauvoir's work and highlights the need for an understanding of women's experiences of the body within patriarchal societies that will prepare the ground for a form of eroticism that is not based upon domination.

4.413: *Signs*

While it is clear that their approach to the topic is not uniform, just under a quarter of the 1980 USA texts in *Feminist Studies* treat sexuality as a key concern. Given that twenty of the thirty-five qualifying texts from *Signs* were in a two-part special issue on *Sex and Sexuality* it is unsurprising that sexuality as well as women's bodies in the reproductive process are central concerns of a number of the texts in this journal. In addition, as is evident in some of the texts in the two journals addressed so far, in a number of the 1980 texts in *Signs* academic feminism's 'progress' in terms of tracking feminist disciplinary trends and identifying male bias within specific academic disciplines form the central focus. The centrality of these particular concerns within texts in the 1980 British sample is,

I believe, less evident, although not entirely absent (e.g. Birke et al., 1980), which seems to suggest that feminism in the USA had made more 'official' inroads into academe than it had in Britain in 1980.

What emerges out of a large number of the texts in *Signs* is a general sense that ideas are of vital importance in both maintaining and fighting women's oppression. Thus, just as Blaubergs (1980) and Silveria (1980) in the 1980 USA sample in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, Martyna (1980b) focuses on the power of language to define and legitimise women's oppression, exposes the sexism in male generics and outlines arguments for non-sexist language. Tuchman and Fortin (1980) examine the manuscripts by women that were accepted and rejected by MacMillan publishers in the 19th Century. Their focus on male bias within literary establishments exhibits some links to Walters' (1980) article in the British 1980 sample. In contrast, Diamond (1980), whilst stressing her anti-essentialist views, addresses the contemporary differences between mainstream liberal and radical feminist arguments about the regulation of pornography that focus on the issues of individual choice and male violence towards women.

Yet, unlike Diamond (1980), during a contextualised exploration of the social, economic and political factors surrounding prostitution, Walkowitz (1980b) is critical of the potential regressive nature of radical feminist anti-pornography campaigns. In addition, albeit with different foci that expose the oppressive nature of depictions of women in Harlequin Romances and popular couples advice books in the late 1970s respectively, Modleski (1980) and Ross (1980) stress the importance of broader concrete historical conditions in the shaping of representations.

Directing more specific attention onto sexism and male bias within academic knowledge, dominant sexual paradigms form the focus of Janeway's (1980) article. Here, Janeway (1980) exposes the dependence of these paradigms on oppressive cultural stereotypes of women. Arguing that sexuality is shaped by culture, Person (1980) is critical of the essentialism legitimising hierarchical differences between men and women that she

detects within dominant psychoanalytic paradigms. Yet, critically examining the essentialism and universalism of dominant models in developmental psychology, Rossi (1980) emphasises the ongoing need to explore the interaction of biology with social contexts, a view also seemingly endorsed by Baker (1980).

These articles tend to highlight male bias within the biological and psychological sciences and stress the need for different approaches to be taken. However, texts by Goodman (1980), Leifer (1980), Wiesskopf (1980) and Miller and Foulkes (1980) evaluate the impact of feminism on research related to menopause, pregnancy, sexuality and motherhood, and sexuality more generally. Nevertheless, for a cluster of articles, the emphasis shifts once again and pays more sustained attention to trends within feminist knowledge in the humanities and social sciences.

In Miller and Foulkes' (1980) exploration of sexuality, the authors are positive about the way research into sexuality appears to increasingly endorse an acknowledgement of sexual diversity. Similarly, sexual diversity is a trend that Snitow (1980) identifies in her examination of depictions of sex in novels written by women between 1969 and 1979. Continuing to stress the notion of diversity and addressing trends within feminist literary criticism that appear to be similar to those Kolodny (1980) identified in *Feminist Studies*, Register (1980) claims that a stage has been reached where multiple and diverse readings of individual texts are being accepted as equally valid. In contrast, in order to achieve a more comprehensive understanding of patriarchy, it is the need for pluralism in approaches within political science that arises in Carroll's (1980) critical reflection on the differences between and limitations of attempts to mix Marxism and feminism.

While seemingly retaining more allegiance to approaches that mix Marxism and feminism in some form than both Register (1980) and Carroll (1980), pluralism, here in the form of interdisciplinarity, continues to be a theme that is evident in articles by Gould (1980), Strober and Tyack (1980) and Rosaldo (1980). Gould (1980) is positive about the interdisciplinary approaches taken by feminist academics within sociology and their

interest in the sociology of knowledge. However, just as Hoagland (1980) does in the USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, the author stresses the continuing sexism within the discipline by highlighting the recent growth in interest in sociobiology. Interdisciplinary approaches are, again, endorsed positively along with mixing qualitative and quantitative research methods in Strober and Tyack's (1980) study of school teaching in the 19th Century. In addition, interdisciplinarity is evident within Rosaldo's (1980) article, which focuses on the uses of anthropological approaches within and outside the discipline. Yet, while positive about the way feminist academics use anthropological approaches when compared to mainstream researchers, the author criticises feminists' lack of attention to the broader social relations that structure women's activities - revealing traces of the debates within women's history in *Feminist Studies*.

With less evidence of a concern with interdisciplinarity, Russell (1980) suggests that the two key trends identifiable within feminist art history are, first, examining differences between women and men - both in art practice and in depictions of women by male artists - and, secondly, unearthing 'lost' women artists. For Wood (1980), it is the general potential for feminist activity within the relatively new discipline of musicology that is emphasised.

While concerned with the knowledge acquired and produced by women, Tidball's (1980) exploration of women's colleges focuses central attention on investigating the concrete settings and ideological conditions that foster or inhibit women achieving. For Green (1980), it is the research process during investigations involving Native-American women that is under the spotlight. Here, the author suggests that feminist scholars need to begin to actually listen to the particular needs of these women when designing research projects.

The majority of the remaining texts in this journal focus in some way on sexuality, or the processes involved in reproduction, as was the case in a number of the texts from *Signs* already mentioned. Three of these remaining articles are concerned with non-white

women, albeit with less evidence of a concern with hierarchical ethnic differences among women than Green's (1980) text demonstrated. In addition, these three articles are concerned with symbolism in some form. Safa-Isfahani (1980) explores the way Iranian women participate in defining their own sexuality during 'dramatic games'. With more caution about celebrating women's agency, Joseph (1980) considers how songs by Middle Eastern Berber women at wedding ceremonies appear to re-enforce the system of patriarchy. Finally, contrasting oppressive Western dominant ideas about menstruation with more empowering Ogala menstrual myths and rituals, Powers (1980) highlights the need for understanding these ideas within the broader material, here appearing to mean social and economic, contexts in which they arise.

While Powers (1980) points out the ongoing need for developing feminist theory, developments within feminist theory form the focus of Burke (1980), Shulman (1980), Rich (1980) and Petchesky's (1980) texts. Introducing a translation of Luce Irigaray's Lacanian influenced text, 'When Our Lips Speak Together' (1980)², Burke (1980) emphasises that this author's work is little known in the USA yet is positive about the way female sexual symbolism is used to encourage women to explore the multiple and shifting nature of their individual identities. With less evidence of sensitivity towards differences among women or the multiple nature of individual women's identities, Shulman (1980) examines the visionary nature of radical feminist theories of sexuality that has developed from their critique of male power. In addition, Rich's (1980) critique of compulsory heterosexuality exposes the physical and mental domination of women by men.

Moving the focus from sexuality to childbirth, Petchesky (1980) contrasts the individualism of liberal feminist views with radical feminist views in which childbirth is regarded as shaped by patriarchal society. Clearly influenced by radical rather than liberal feminist views, Dye (1980) and Leavitt's (1980) historical accounts of childbirth procedures stress the increasing exploitation and control of women's bodies by men.

² This translated text did not qualify for the 1980 USA sample as the author was not based in the USA

Admittedly, without a specific focus on sexuality or childbirth, the two remaining texts continue Dye (1980) and Leavitt's (1980) concern with male power and control over women. Thus, Allen and Hubbs (1980) explore male alchemists' appropriation and control of female powers and Kraemer (1980) reflects on how the rigid self-denial imposed by ascetic forms of Christianity, ironically, may have provided a type of male-free environment that was conducive to women's self-definition.

4.414: Books

As with a number of texts in *Signs* and *Feminist Studies*, in three of the ten books in the 1980 USA sample, though each differ in their approaches, issues related to sexuality are key concerns. Just as in Diamond's (1980) article in *Signs*, pornography provides the focus for the entries in Lederer's (1980) book, which takes its name from the first Take Back the Night protest march. This protest was staged during the 1978 Women Against Violence in Pornography and the Media conference in San Francisco. While a few chapters demonstrate sensitivity to differences among women in terms of ethnicity and sexual orientation, it does not appear that problematizing these differences is a primary concern of the book as a whole. Instead, the central aim of the book seems to be exposing and examining the violence of the single system of patriarchy as it manifests itself in the content and effects of pornographic representations of women. However, seemingly contradicting the tendency in Lederer's (1980) text towards a cause and effect thesis in relation to violence and sexual representations, Friday (1980) appears to view men's sexual fantasies as a means of avoiding rather than promoting war between the sexes in the real world. Nevertheless, linking fantasy to the psychological development of young children that arises out of the mother-child relationship, Friday (1980) calls for moves towards equal participation of mothers and fathers in child-rearing. Likewise, appearing to be influenced by dual systems approaches, Lazzarre's (1980b) autobiographical reflective account of heterosexuality links sexuality to the type of early psychological development that results from exclusive mother-raising.

O'Kelly (1980) exhibits less concern with psychoanalytic arguments than either Friday (1980) or Lazarre (1980b), and takes a more thoroughly historical materialist approach. In her sweeping historical overview of different types of societies, analyses of social relations between men and women in production and reproduction are O'Kelly's (1980) central concern. As a result, she not only argues for more equal sharing of childcare between men and women but also stresses the need for greater economic independence for women and the elimination of class inequality. Unequal social relations between men and women, specifically within the Black Civil Rights Movement and the student New Left, also form the focus for Evans' (1980b) examination of the historical development of the Women's Liberation Movement in the USA in the 1960s.

The theme of one of the special issues in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, namely, sexism in the media, is shared by Butler and Paisley's (1980) book. It, again, highlights concrete differences between men and women, here, in terms of their roles in society in general as well as unequal employment within media institutions. Viewing the media as a microcosm of the broader social, economic and political contexts of which it is a part, reflects and, consequently, legitimises, the authors flag up these concrete differences as the cause of sexism in media representations. In contrast, addressing the 'female domestic culture' that is claimed to have arisen and begun to fall between the early and late 19th Century, it is relationships between women within this culture that are emphasised and celebrated in Katz and Rapone's (1980) text. This type of approach, which bears the imprint of cultural feminist influence and is debated in the symposium in *Feminist Studies*, is acknowledged by Eisenstein and Jardine (1980) as gaining ground in the USA during the 1970s following an initial dominant concern with relations between men and women. Moreover, as is suggested by some of the entries within their text, which were drawn from a conference on the concept of difference within feminism held in New York in 1979, Eisenstein and Jardine (1980) also claim that differences among women are beginning to be analysed more frequently. With psychology and psychoanalysis seeming to dominate in a large number of the chapters, the editors stress the newness of the poststructuralist oriented 'French Feminisms' that form the specific focus of one section in

the book. These 'new' approaches are regarded as contrasting with USA feminism's use of psychoanalysis due to their reliance on Lacanian rather than object-relations theory.

The sensitivity to differences among women that Eisenstein and Jardine (1980) highlight as beginning to gain ground generally within feminism in the USA is evident in Cantarrow's (1980) text, which draws on oral histories of three political activists. Collectively, the oral histories in the Cantarrow text contribute to the process of uncovering women's participation in social movements in the 20th Century in the USA. These histories depict the experiences of one white woman who was active in the suffragette, labour, peace and second wave women's movement, one black woman who was active in the civil rights and black liberation movement and a Mexican-American woman who participated in farm workers' struggles for land ownership in the USA. Finally, first published in 1900, Dall's (1980) autobiographical text sketches out the author's education, social activities, teaching experiences, participation in a creche in her local community, the antislavery movement and the formation of the Association for the Advancement of Social Science. Forming part of a series, *Signal Lives Autobiographies of American Women*, this reprint, like Cantarrow's (1980) text, appears to form part of the second-wave feminist process of uncovering the lives of women in history, this time in the 19th rather than 20th Century.

4.42: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives

The dominant perspectives that are predicted in Hypothesis One to be informing the USA 1980 sample texts are the same as those predicted for the 1980 British sample, namely, historical materialist perspectives. Just as with the 1980 British sample, this prediction contrasts with the dominant perspectives expected for the 1998 USA sample, where dominance is expected to have swung towards poststructuralist perspectives. In line with the conclusions I reached when considering the British 1980 sample, I will suggest below that there is more evidence of historical materialism in the 1980 USA texts than

poststructuralism. However, as I found with the 1980 British sample, I do not believe it is possible to conclude from the texts that historical materialism is dominant in the 1980 USA sample when the texts are looked at collectively.

During my descriptions of the USA texts I pointed out that, while not the dominant influence, there seems to be more evidence of socialist feminist insights in the USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* than there is in the 1980 British texts in this journal. Consequently, this observation suggests that more of the USA texts than the British texts in this journal are informed, at least in part, by Marxist forms of historical materialism. Nevertheless, nine of the fourteen USA texts in this journal take language, in either its spoken or written form, as the central focus of analysis. Moreover, during these analyses broader material structures, while at times hinted at as requiring investigation in the future (e.g. Engle, 1980; Greif, 1980; Scott, 1980), remain relatively absent. Certainly, differences in emphasis, suggesting evidence of, for example, cultural feminism (e.g. Wolfe & Stanley, 1980), radical feminism (e.g. Hoagland, 1980), psychoanalytic feminism (e.g. Salem, 1980) and a more liberal inflected concern with gender role socialisation (e.g. Greif, 1980; Engle, 1980), appear to be identifiable in these texts. Yet, in the studies conducted, the view of language that is portrayed does not exhibit the fluidity or multiplicity that would generally be associated with poststructuralism.

While there is evidence of theoretical debates and differences in the approaches taken by the authors, I believe that *Feminist Studies* stands out as the journal containing the greatest evidence of socialist feminist orientated texts in the USA sample. However, just as in the British sample, a number of texts in *Feminist Studies* demonstrate that differences exist about how to articulate a satisfactory synthesis of Marxism and radical feminism. These differences are apparent, for example, in texts by Rhorlich (1980), Dijkstra (1980), Felstiner (1980), Stansell (1980), Van Allen (1980), Kenedy and Lapidus (1980), Glenn (1980), Hull (1980), Vance (1980) and Kaplan (1980). By demonstrating sensitivity to 'race' as well as to gender and class, at least some of these texts also seek to incorporate the insights of black feminism into their synthesis (e.g. Kenedy & Lapidus,

1980; Glenn, 1980; Hull, 1980; Vance, 1980; Kaplan, 1980). There is also evidence of differences between authors who advocate more thoroughly historical materialist approaches and those who regard the separate bases of women's oppression to be both material, in a historical materialist sense, and ideological (e.g. Van Allen, 1980; Vance, 1980; Felstiner, 1980). In addition, in the symposium on politics and culture in women's history, it is evident that there is a debate about a movement away from accounts that are informed by historical materialist insights towards forms of cultural feminism that, here, are claimed to ignore broader social, economic and political contexts.

Contrary to the claims of some of the symposium authors, Ruddick (1980) and Ulrich (1980) do appear to attempt to utilise historical materialist insights in their seemingly cultural feminist influenced approaches. However, just as I would question the extent to which Ruddick (1980) develops a convincing *historical* approach to 'maternal thinking', the linking of sexuality to social relations in the psychoanalytically oriented texts by Ramas (1980) and Benjamin (1980) appears to lack the genuine concern with historical context that would be expected in a historical materialist account. Indeed, it is the ongoing need for a contextual theory of female eroticism that is highlighted by Fuchs (1980).

Collectively, I would argue that, with only a few exceptions (e.g. Diehl, 1980; Kolodny, 1980), the majority of the authors in *Feminist Studies* seem to *want* to develop accounts that take concrete social relations into account as the key shaping factor of women's experiences. As I mentioned above, however, what I believe is lacking in at least some of these texts is the sense of history (whether this lack is intentional or not) that would lead me to place them firmly into a historical materialist camp. Indeed, of all of the authors in this journal I believe it is only Kolodny (1980) who, although arguing for pluralism in theoretical approaches, demonstrates evidence of the beginnings of the growth of poststructuralism.

I mentioned above that out of all of the journals included in the USA 1980 sample that *Feminist Studies* appears to be the one that is most tipped towards socialist feminism,

although not exclusively so. In contrast the texts included in the USA sample from *Signs* appear to be more radically oriented overall, thus, demonstrating a concern with gender in which attention to class differences are relatively absent. Indeed, it is *Signs* that contains the only article in the sample assessing attempts to synthesise Marxism and feminism - the socialist feminist project - that suggests the time has come to abandon this project (Carroll, 1980).

Of course it would be wrong to assume from the above that socialist feminism is absent from *Signs*, Ross (1980), Walkowitz (1980b), Gould (1980) and Powers (1980) for example, do seem to stress the importance of the economic as a contributing factor to women's oppression. In addition, it is important to note that one whole special issue, focussing on *Women and the American City*, was excluded from the sample because it was published as a supplement during 1980. Therefore, whether the articles in this particular special issue would have altered what I suggest is a more radical than socialist bias in *Signs* remains unknown. Furthermore, authors such as Rossi (1980) and Rosaldo (1980) highlight the need to take broader social contexts into account in their respective analyses. While this seems to point towards a project yet to be done, these authors do seem to hint at a desire for historical materialism in some form.

In some of the more radically oriented texts (e.g. Dye 1980; Modleski 1980), the attention granted to history and changing social conditions seems to hint towards sensitivity to historical materialism. In addition, Petchesky (1980) contrasts the individualism of liberal feminism with what she suggests to be the more socially oriented approaches of radical feminism. Yet in a number of articles analysis does seem to be focussed on the power of language (e.g. Martyna, 1980b), values (e.g. Tuchman & Fortin, 1980), representation (e.g. Janeway, 1980; Safa-Isfahani, 1980) or culture (e.g. Person, 1980) in a manner that seems to leave the question of whether there is any type of external base open to question. Therefore, these texts may seem to resemble a number of the articles in the *Women's Studies International Quarterly* 1980 British sample. Still other texts, with their

emphasis placed on male power and female connectedness, whether intended or not, seem to hint at essentialism (e.g. Rich 1980; Allen & Hubbs; 1980, Kraemer, 1980).

I hope, thus far, to have demonstrated that the variety of approaches in *Signs* sheds doubt upon the dominance of historical materialism in this journal. However, despite this variety, I would suggest that there are only two articles that demonstrate real evidence of poststructuralist influence in *Signs*. These are Register's (1980) review of literary criticism, which highlights the acceptance of multiple and diverse readings of texts within this discipline, and Burke's (1980) introduction to the work of Luce Irigaray, which is work that is regarded as little known in the USA at the time.

Compared to the British 1980 sample, I believe that there are fewer books in the USA sample that immediately stand out as being influenced by historical materialism. In part, I believe this is due to the focus of a number of the British texts, which included explicit attempts to debate and develop historical materialist theory along socialist or, to a lesser extent, radical feminist lines and struggles over feminism's relationship to the broader socialist movement. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the approaches taken by O'Kelly (1980), Butler and Paisley (1980), Evans (1980b) and Cantarrow (1980), stressing history and social relations between men and women, all appear to be guided by historical materialist insights. In addition, while focussing on analysing what is regarded as 'female domestic culture', Katz and Rapone's (1980) seemingly cultural feminist oriented book does appear to be based in a form of historical materialism. According to Katz and Rapone (1980), this particular culture is one that developed out of and declined as a result of changing gender-based social structures and relations during the 19th Century. These five books, however, seem to contrast with the types of radical feminist perspectives influencing Lederer's (1980) text, which, on the whole, appear to waver between essentialism and idealism.

Slightly more explicit in the USA books than in the British ones, although by no means the central focus of the majority of texts, is a sensitivity to difference in terms of 'race', which is

associated with Black feminism (e.g. Cantarrow, 1980; Eisenstein & Jardine, 1980; Evans, 1980b). Certainly, all of the USA journals contain at least one article showing some sensitivity to hierarchical differences between women in terms of 'race'. Yet such articles are relatively few (e.g. Anthony, (1980) in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, Kenedy & Lapidus (1980), Glenn (1980), Hull (1980), Vance (1980), Kaplan (1980), in *Feminist Studies* and Green (1980) in *Signs*). In addition, the USA books and journal sample seem to include more of an explicit focus on psychoanalysis than the British sample as a whole, which maybe due in part to the greater focus on sexuality and mother-child relationships in the USA texts. Yet what seems to be suggested in Lazzare's (1980b) dual systems influenced analysis and in Friday's (1980) approach is that this focus is more informed by materially oriented types of psychoanalysis, which stress the social relations of child-rearing, than by Lacanian oriented types, which stress the importance of language and representation. Although they maybe open to charges of being ahistorical in the way they appear to be depicted in the texts in the sample, these types of psychoanalytic approaches would therefore not be associated with poststructuralism. Indeed, the only book in the USA sample that appears to bear real evidence of poststructuralist influence contrasts the newness of this approach in psychoanalytic accounts in the USA with object relations theory, which is claimed to be dominant (Eisentein & Jardine 1980).

As with the British 1980 sample, I believe that there is firm evidence to confirm that historical materialist perspectives influence more of the texts in the USA sample than poststructuralist perspectives do. As with the British 1980 sample, it is clear that, while not totally non-existent, only a very small number of the texts seem to suggest that poststructuralist insights were circulating within academic feminism in the USA in 1980. Nevertheless, as I pointed out above and just as I found in the British 1980 sample, there are a number of texts that seem to hint at essentialism or make it difficult to ascertain exactly where the base(s) for women's oppression is or are regarded as lying. Therefore, it seems sensible to reserve judgement about whether or to what extent historical materialism is the dominant perspective influencing academic feminism in the USA in 1980.

4.43: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts

According to the second hypothesis the content of the 1980 USA texts is expected to be more oriented towards addressing concrete material social and economic issues rather than cultural issues such as those pertaining to language, representation, symbolisation and discourse. Furthermore women's oppression is expected to be described and analysed more as a collective issue requiring collective responses to end it rather than seeking ways to understand and analyse the oppression of individual women and their personal responses to it. In line with the conclusion that I reached when discussing the 1980 British sample, I will suggest that, while the second aspect of Hypothesis Two is confirmed in the USA 1980 sample, it is prudent to reserve judgement on the first.

Just as I found in the 1980 British texts and contrary to what is expected, it is cultural issues rather than material ones that appear to be dominant in the USA texts in *Women's International Quarterly*. Given the focus of the special issues, *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* and *Women and Media*, plus the fact that only two articles in the USA sample (Humphries, 1980; Anthony, 1980) were not in either special issue this finding is probably unsurprising. However, in contrast to the British sample, it is representation in the form of language rather than media depictions that seems to be the more dominant focus.

Nine of the fourteen texts in the USA sample take language as the central focus (Wolfe & Stanley, 1980; Hoagland, 1980; Blaubergs, 1980; Silveria, 1980; Greif, 1980; Engle, 1980; Scott, 1980; Martyna, 1980a; Salem, 1980). While in a few of these texts, context in the form of social background and social settings does, admittedly, gain mention as a factor to be included in future research (e.g. Grief, 1980; Engle, 1980; Scott, 1980), it does not seem to be the key concern of these particular investigations. In addition, all of the five remaining texts are, to greater and lesser degrees, concerned with issues that might be regarded as cultural in some way. These texts include examinations of media depictions of working women (Glazer, 1980); depictions of working and middle class women in

fotonovellas (Flora, 1980); abortion laws (Humphries, 1980); affirmative action policies (Eddings, 1980) and racial and sexual prejudice (Anthony, 1980). All of these remaining texts do demonstrate much greater sensitivity to social and economic issues during their analyses, mainly in terms of the shaping power of the social and economic. Yet it is clearly evident that cultural issues dominate in the USA texts in this journal as a whole.

Overall, the issues addressed seem to be framed in terms of being collective ones. For example, on the whole, in the articles where language is analysed, it seems to be women as a group who are being addressed. Where differences among women are taken into consideration, for example, in terms of class (e.g. Humphries, 1980; Flora, 1980), these differences tend to be framed in a manner that suggests they are the products of large systems that require societal change. In addition, while calling for action at individual levels, Anthony's (1980) article, addressing institutional racism and sexism, also stresses the need for changes at collective levels.

Just as I suggested when describing the texts in *Feminist Review* and discussing the 1980 British book sample, many of the texts in *Feminist Studies* do seem to be concerned with issues that in themselves might not be labelled as material ones. Nevertheless, as with these particular texts in the British sample, I will suggest that in *Feminist Studies* it is social and economic issues rather than cultural ones that dominate as the primary concern. Certainly, it is evident in the six contributions in the symposium on politics and culture that there is concern and disagreement about what is depicted as a growing tendency in women's history to focus on culture. In addition, a large number of the texts, including those in the symposium just mentioned, are concerned with issues that could be regarded as cultural in as much as a key concern seems to be debating and developing theory or exploring directions in which feminist knowledge is moving. This concern appears to be central to the contributions by, for example, Rhorhlich (1980), Felstiner (1980), Stansell (1980), Van Allen (1980), Kenedy and Lapidus (1980), Hull (1980), Vance (1980), Kolodny (1980), Ramas, (1980), Ruddick (1980) and Fuchs (1980). Nevertheless, apart from Kolodny's (1980) review of literary criticism, I would argue that in these texts

material issues are central in as much as the authors are concerned with developing theory that takes the shaping power of historical social and economic relations into consideration. Even Ruddick (1980), for example, who is concerned with 'maternal thinking', argues that this type of thinking arises out of the caring work that is carried out most often, but not exclusively so, by mothers.

With some exceptions (e.g. Ladimer, 1980; Diehl, 1980; Cook, 1980), I would maintain that material issues are also central to the majority of the remaining texts in this journal. Here, for example, these are addressed variously as life experiences in general in relation to sexuality (e.g. Rapp, 1980; Gidlow, 1980) and work or family relationships in particular (e.g. Glenn, 1980; Ulrich, 1980; Clawson, 1980, Lazarre, 1980a).

Once again the general sense arising out of *Feminist Studies* is that women's oppression is a collective issue. Certainly, there is slightly more sensitivity to towards different groups of women in terms of 'race' (e.g. Glenn, 1980; Hull, 1980; Vance, 1980; Kaplan, 1980) and sexuality (e.g. Cook, 1980; Rapp, 1980; Gidlow, 1980; Ramas, 1980) than can be seen in the texts in either of the British journals or the those in the USA sample from *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. Yet, within the context of the journal as a whole, this greater sensitivity is negligible.

Just as I suggested when considering the texts in *Feminist Studies*, contrary to the expected results, I believe that a large number of the texts in *Signs* are concerned with issues that could be regarded as more cultural than material because of their concern with tracing and debating developments within knowledge. In this journal, there are texts that are directly investigating and attacking sexist biases in mainstream academic knowledge. Here, for example, texts address the shaping of sexual paradigms by sexist cultural stereotypes (Janeway, 1980) and essentialism in psychoanalytic paradigms and theoretical models in developmental psychology (Person, 1980; Rossi, 1980). Sexist bias is also attacked in popular literature (e.g. Modleski, 1980, Ross 1980). In other texts it is the evaluation of the impact of feminism on mainstream knowledge related to menopause,

pregnancy, sexuality and motherhood that forms the focus (Goodman, 1980; Leifer 1980; Wiesskopf, 1980; Miller & Foulkes 1980).

Continuing to focus on knowledge but turning the spotlight more firmly on academic feminism itself, articles track trends along disciplinary lines such as literary criticism (Register, 1980), Political Science (Carroll, 1980), Sociology (Gould, 1980), Anthropology (Rosaldo, 1980), Art History (Russell, 1980) and Musicology (Wood, 1980). Texts also examine more general theoretical perspectives such as trends in radical feminist theories of sexuality (Shulman, 1980) and differences between liberal and radical feminist theories of childbirth (Petchesky, 1980). In addition, Burke (1980) introduces and explains the 'new' theoretical approach used by Luce Irigaray, Rich (1980) develops her critique of compulsory heterosexuality through a critical analysis of mainstream and feminist knowledge and Powers (1980) highlights the need for theory that takes into account the interaction of biology and social context during her analysis of Ogala menstrual myths and rituals. As final examples, Diamond (1980) contrasts mainstream liberal views on pornography with radical feminist views and Snitow (1980) examines depictions of sex in recent novels by women.

Perhaps more so than before, the apparent feminist preoccupation with ideas, particularly, although, not exclusively, in the form of academic knowledge, seems to throw into question what the primary concerns of the texts are here. However, if the content of the texts is taken as an overview of the type of issues being researched I believe they reveal that the concerns were a mixture cultural and material ones. Practices and procedures, social contexts, activities such as work as well as representation in, for example, pornography, popular literature, general cultural stereotypes and art practice are addressed, albeit, admittedly, with differing emphasis in the texts. In addition, the remaining texts demonstrate a mixture of concerns. In some texts these concerns might be regarded as cultural, for example, in the form of language (Martyna, 1980b), male values (Tuchman & Fortin, 1980) and symbolism (Safa-Isfahani 1980). Yet in others, for example, examining prostitution in its social, economic and political contexts (Walkowitz,

1980b) and the history of school teaching (Strober & Tyack, 1980) or childbirth procedures (Dye 1980; Leavit 1980), they could be viewed as more material. Consequently, I do not believe that it is possible to say that the dominant issues addressed in this journal were either material or cultural. Instead, what is evident is a mixture of material and cultural concerns.

On the whole, I believe that an individualist outlook is relatively absent from the texts in *Signs*. Certainly, Burke's (1980) text, stressing the multiplicity of female language, and Miller and Foulkes' (1980) and Snitow's (1980) respective analyses of sexuality seem to highlight the notion of diversity between individual women. Yet even Green (1980) and Joseph (1980), who demonstrate sensitivity towards the specific needs or way of life of particular women based on ethnicity, still seem to address these particular women as members of a group that is collectively constrained by social structures. Indeed, where mentioned in the texts, the notion that women's oppression is an individual problem appears to be done so critically (e.g. Diamond, 1980; Petchesky, 1980).

While I would hold that it is possible to identify evidence of a concern with both material and cultural issues within each of the texts in the 1980 USA book sample, I believe that slight differences in emphasis are evident among the texts. Moreover, it appears that there is a relatively even split between texts in which material issues tend to dominate and those in which cultural issues dominate.

The tendency towards greater concern with material issues is evident in Lazarre's (1980b) autobiographical account of heterosexuality, O'Kelly's (1980) exploration of work and family life in different societies, Evans' (1980b) account of how second wave feminism emerged out of women's experiences in the Black Civil Rights Movement and the New Left, Cantarrow's (1980) account of the experiences of three political activists and Dall's (1980) more general autobiography. Yet, despite demonstrating concern with material issues, I would argue that it is cultural issues that are more dominant in the remaining texts.

Focussing on the media, Butler and Paisley (1980) do address material activities by examining the working conditions within media institutions as well as their products. Yet, simply due to the amount of space granted to each form of analysis in the book, cultural issues are more dominant. I would maintain that the focus of both Lederer (1980) and Friday's (1980) texts, which interrogate pornography and sexual fantasy respectively, is much more heavily oriented towards issues that would be regarded as cultural. Nevertheless, at least in Lederer's (1980) text, material issues, such as violence and exploitation in the making of pornography and its concrete effects, are certainly the underpinning factors. Again while tending towards a greater emphasis on cultural issues overall, Katz and Rapone's (1980) text, exploring the rise and decline of female domestic culture, includes chapters addressing the material working conditions of women. Finally, material issues are not absent from some of the entries of Eisenstein and Jardine's (1980) text, in terms of (for example) the social relations of child-rearing. However, on the whole, the heavy focus on (for example) language, speech and literature once again results in a bias towards cultural rather than material issues.

In line with my arguments about the 1980 USA sample so far, I believe that the books are more collectivist than individualist in orientation. Three of the texts are, admittedly, based on autobiographical accounts of individual lives. Yet two of these texts make explicit references in their introduction that suggest the commonality of women's experiences (Lazarre, 1980b; Dall, 1980) and the third, like Evans' (1980b) book, is about women participating in collective political action. Calls for collective action against pornography are peppered throughout Lederer's (1980) text and Butler and Paisley's (1980) conclusion highlights the need for societal change and outlines strategies for collective as well as individual action against media sexism. In addition, whether depicted in terms of a 'female domestic culture' or as arising out of a particular system of child rearing, commonalities among women and their collective difference from men are emphasised by Katz and Rapone (1980) and Friday (1980).

The USA book sample does contain evidence of slightly more sensitivity to differences among women in terms of 'race' than the British sample. Yet, where it is addressed, racism, just as sexism, is depicted as a collective issue (e.g. Evans, 1980b; Cantarrow, 1980). Indeed, even though it is the concept of difference, which here includes differences among women as well as differences between women and men, that comes under the spotlight in Eisenstein and Jardine's (1980) text, political action, when it is directly addressed, is regarded as entailing collective action.

Overall, then, the conclusions I have reached when considering the USA 1980 sample in relation to Hypothesis Two are similar to those that I reached when considering the British 1980 sample. Thus, while I do not believe there is firm evidence to confirm that material issues were of greater concern than cultural ones in the USA 1980 sample, it does seem that the orientation of the texts is more collectivist than individualist.

4.5: Summary of 1980 Immanent Analysis - Hypotheses One and Two

The main findings of the analysis of the 1980 sample groupings, in relation to Hypotheses One and Two in this chapter, are now summarised:

In line with Hypothesis One, there was more evidence of historical materialism than poststructuralism within both of the 1980 sample groupings. However, I did not believe that there was sufficient evidence to suggest that historical materialist perspectives were dominant over all. Yet, while not forming the main focus of my analysis, having kept an eye on the multiple perspectives outlined in Chapter Three, I believe that two internally heterogeneous key perspectives are identifiable in my reflections on both of the sample groups. These perspectives are those that can be broadly labelled socialist feminism - attending to capitalism and patriarchy - and radical feminism - focussing more attention directly on patriarchy. Nevertheless, while not absent from the 1980 British sample, I have pointed out that cultural feminism, which might be regarded as one of radical feminism's

'offspring', also seemed to be attracting growing attention in the USA. It was also clear that both liberal and Black feminism, for example, appeared to be influencing some of the texts in both of the sample groups. In terms of Hypothesis Two, contrary to what was predicted by the first part of this hypothesis, I did not conclude that material issues were more dominant than cultural ones in either of the 1980 sample groupings. Instead, I suggested that both sample groups exhibited a mixture of cultural and material concerns. However, in line with what the second aspect of hypothesis two predicted, I suggested that the general outlook of the majority of the texts in both sample groups did appear to be collectivist. Thus, bearing these findings in mind, I will consider the 1998 texts in the next chapter.

Chapter Five: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:

Britain and the USA 1998

5.1: Introduction

Having described and reflected on the 1980 British and USA sample texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two in the last chapter, I will now turn to focus my attention on the 1998 sample texts. The chapter will be divided into three main sections. In the first two sections I will focus on the 1998 British and USA sample texts respectively. Both of these main sections will be divided into three sub-sections to allow me to describe the texts and then reflect on Hypotheses One and Two in turn. To help draw attention to some of the key similarities and differences between the 1980 and 1998 samples in relation to the first two hypotheses, I will, at times, refer to the conclusions I drew from the 1980 texts in last chapter during these two main sections. In the final section, I will draw together my findings from all four sample groups, consider them in relation to Hypothesis Three and highlight some general observations about the similarities and differences between the 1980 and 1998 texts.

5.2: The 1998 British Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two

In this section I will focus on the 1998 British sample texts. I will begin with a brief description of each text falling in the sample. Following this, I will consider the texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two.

5.21: Descriptions

The qualifying texts for the 1998 British sample totalled twenty-seven journal contributions and twelve books. Of the journal contributions, five were from issues of *Feminist Review*

and twenty-two were from *Women's Studies International Forum* (formerly, as in 1980, *Women's Studies International Quarterly*). Of the book sample, six were single author books, one was a joint authored book, two were books with one editor and three were joint-edited books. The bibliographic details for the 1998 British sample texts can be found in Appendix III. To allow for comparisons to be made between the different journals under consideration and the book sample, I will begin by describing the content of each separately.

5.211: Feminist Review

Due, at least in part, to the fact that the one special issue in *Feminist Review*, *Rethinking Caribbean Difference*, contained no qualifying contributions for the 1998 British sample, only five of the qualifying texts for the British 1998 sample as a whole were published in this journal. In contrast to the dominant concern arising out of sample texts from *Feminist Review* in 1980, I believe that only one of these five texts demonstrates any real evidence that Marx matters.

In this article, Spence (1998) argues for a broadening out of the Marxist notion of material to include the community and environment as well as the economic during her exploration of women campaigners' political action against the closure of the Vane Tempest Colliery in 1993. Spence constructs a view of women and men that seems to emphasise the notion that men and women, as two distinct groups, have different relationships to the economic. However, Prohovnick (1998) criticises the two dominant feminist models of citizenship that focus on either public sphere economic and formal political participation or the private sphere maternal qualities of women. It is a concern with differences among women, as well as among men, in the public and private spheres that leads her to advocate a notion of citizenship as a moral relationship.

Differences among women are also a central concern for Breitenbach et al. (1998) who criticise feminist work on British women for silencing the double oppression of Scottish

women, which they claim results from English cultural imperialism and male cultural and political domination in Scotland. Likewise, Smyth (1998) is concerned with nationality. Drawing on Benedict Anderson's concept of the nation as an imagined community, the author explores shifts occurring in ideas about Irishness within the discourses of abortion that were circulating during the X case in 1992. In this case a fourteen year-old rape victim was prevented from obtaining an abortion in Britain. Finally, keeping a focus on the internal workings of discourse, Attwood (1998) utilises the insights of Lacan and Foucault to explore the way the concept of difference circulates within Jane Campion's 1993 film, *The Piano*. The author is not simply concerned with examining difference between women and men but also among women and within individual women in terms of their multiple and shifting identities.

5.212: *Women's Studies International Forum*

Just as one special issue, *Rethinking Caribbean Difference*, in *Feminist Review* contained no qualifying texts for the 1998 British sample, one of the special issues in *Women's Studies International Forum*, *Migrating Feminisms: The Asia Pacific Region*, stemming from a conference in Australia in 1994, also contained no qualifying texts for the 1998 British sample. However, the second special issue in *Women's Studies International Forum*, *Women, Imperialism and Identity*, stemming from a conference in Britain in 1995, contained seven of the twenty-two texts qualifying for the 1998 British sample. To the extent that all of the seven texts in the special issue are in some way concerned with ideas and representation they could be viewed as bearing some similarity to those in the 1980 British sample from *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. However, the actual orientation of the majority of these seven texts is very different due to the way they emphasise not only hierarchical differences among women but also women's agency in the construction of these hierarchical differences.

In the special issue, evangelical child-rearing practices and female missionary work form the focus for Twells' (1998) exploration of the discursive construction of the 19th Century British missionary identity in which hierarchical gender, class and 'race' differences were

established. In addition, the discursive construction of notions about 19th or early 20th Century Englishness, whiteness, femininity and imperialism are explored in Beetham's (1998) analysis of readers' letters in a women's magazine, Rowbotham's (1998) exploration of British missionary women's written reports of their overseas experiences and observations, Tuson's (1998) investigation of diaries and letters written by British women who experienced the 'Indian Mutiny' in 1857 and Bush's (1998) examination of documents by and about British women in leading imperialist organisations. In contrast, Hurley (1998) attempts to begin to expose the agency of early 20th Century Indian women by focussing on the Begam of Bhopal's reflections on and reactions to her foreign experiences and revealing how, in these, she both incorporated and resisted imperialist ideas. Finally, in contrast to the majority of the authors in the special issue, Doy (1998) focuses on images of Black women in photographs produced by *men*. She explicitly sets her analysis within a Marxist framework and criticises the dominance of poststructuralist approaches, specifically in analyses of women and visual imagery, for their lack of attention to an external material reality that she argues is not simply the product of ideas.

The notion of difference in the form of national identity and ethnicity continues to be a theme running through a number of the texts in *Women's Studies International Forum*. Many of the texts in the special issue mentioned above were concerned with the notion of 'Englishness' as a discursively constructed identity that achieves a superior status through the articulation of difference. However, focussing on the *Oprah Winfrey Show*, Epstein and Steinberg (1998) are concerned with exploring the discursive articulation of the white middle-class heterosexual 'American Dream' and alternative, subversive discourses that both threaten and potentiality reinforce it.

Raghuram and Hardhill's (1998) paper is specifically concerned with South Asian women in Britain and explores one female entrepreneur's negotiation of business, Dhaliwal (1998) compares female entrepreneurs and women in family businesses and Bhopal (1998) examines female status and social support networks in extended families. Collectively, these texts highlight the agency of women within the material and ideological structures of

their Muslim communities and also differences among South Asian women. Likewise, Birke and Whitworth (1998) highlight the agency of South Asian Women in Britain, which is here viewed as exercised through reflection on existing belief and value systems. The authors argue that both similarities and important differences exist between these women's active interpretations of science and those of women from other groups.

In addition, Bond and Bywaters (1998) and Crossley (1998) are concerned with women's agency, specifically, in relation to medical science. These authors show women making informed decisions to give up taking hormone replacement therapy despite the lack of assistance from formal healthcare channels (Bond & Bywaters, 1998) and, they use an existential-phenomenological form of analysis to study women making sense of and coping with a HIV-positive diagnosis (Crossley, 1998). Yet, rather than emphasising women's agency, Oakley (1998) uses case studies of cervical cancer screening and hormone replacement therapy to attack feminist postmodern arguments against objectivity and quantitative methods.

Likewise, feminist epistemology and methods are the respective concerns of Kerr (1998) and Wilkinson (1998). Kerr (1998) argues for a form of standpoint epistemology within the natural sciences that is based upon the experiences of women scientists rather than women *per se* and Wilkinson (1998) advocates focus groups, in which meaning and knowledge are collectively negotiated, as a favourable alternative to quantitative methods and one-to-one interviews. In contrast, concentrating on exclusions within feminist research rather than feminist epistemology and research methods, Codd (1998) addresses older women offenders, who she regards as a group that is neglected by both women's studies and criminology.

Some of the general themes that I believe emerge out of a number of the texts I have mentioned in this journal are differences among women, women's agency and the notion that contemporary women are generally 'making it' in the world. Although, it should be noted that these general themes seem to be often articulated as ones that are achieved

through the careful negotiation of social and ideological structures that attempt to constrain women as well as enable them. In this sense, a very different view of women arises than that which is generally evident in the 1980 British sample, where largely undifferentiated systems seem to be acting upon largely undifferentiated women and causing them to act in certain ways. However, while certainly not returning to the 1980 view, central issues of the four remaining texts are the tensions and also insecurities experienced by women, but also feminism in general, even when such women might be regarded as 'making it'.

Thus, focusing on their own experiences as women academics, Andrew and Montague (1998) highlight the importance of female friendship at work for building women's confidence and as a form of resistance to gender oppression in the workplace. Key concerns for Reay (1998) and Hague (1998) are, again, marginalisation as well as co-option. Drawing on Bourdieu's notion of habitus, Reay (1998) reflects on and compares her experiences as a working class student who became a feminist academic with the position of Women's Studies in the academy. Hague (1998) considers both the benefits and potential dangers of multiagency initiatives for feminist organisations concerned with domestic violence. Finally, focussing on dual income professional couples and expatriate work, Hardhill and MacDonald (1998) show that, even when women in heterosexual relationships have 'made it' in the professional world, international assignments are more often offered to their partners and, consequently, it is the women who have to compromise their careers.

5.213: Books

Collectively, I believe that key concerns arising out of the British journal sample for 1998 are, first, differences among women as well as between men and women, particularly, although not exclusively, in relation to 'race' and ethnicity or national identity, and, secondly, women's agency. In this light, I believe that there is evidence of these key concerns within the twelve books in the 1998 British sample.

Within the book sample there is a cluster of books that are concerned specifically with gender, 'race' and ethnicity. Chant and McIlwaine's (1998) text is based on empirical investigations and explores differences and similarities between the experiences and attitudes of men and women from three different generations in nine Commonwealth countries, setting these within each country's political economy. A conference in Britain forms the basis for the work selected for Charles and Hintjens (1998) book. Here, chapters explore the way ethnic identities, arising as ideologies within the social, political and economic structures of particular historical contexts, often legitimise the exploitation of women by men and attract women's complicity yet are also actively and critically negotiated by women. In contrast, guided by Foucault, ethnic identity is treated much more strictly as a discursive issue by Haw (1998) who examines and compares the way Muslim girls' oppression, power and resistance, operates within discourses circulating in a state comprehensive school and in a Muslim girls' school in Britain.

Ghoussoub's (1998) reflective exploration of 'race', ethnicity and gender relations is framed by the context of the Civil War in Lebanon, 1975-1992. The author addresses power relations between the 'West' and the 'Third world' and reveals her own ambivalence about postmodernist arguments. She welcomes their positive endorsement of hybrid identities yet is cautious about accepting cultural relativism. Again framed by the context of war, Plowden (1998) explores the different allegiances of individual women on opposing sides during the English Civil War, 1640-1660. Plowden emphasises the agency that these women exercised during the course of the conflict but also highlights how their actions had neither much impact on the conflict itself nor on the general position of women after the war.

On a more positive note and focusing on British women between 1790 and 1914, the entries selected by Yeo (1998) explore how different groups of women in the public sphere actively challenged and reworked dominant discourses of femininity. Representations of femininity are also a key theme in Chedgzoy and Hansen's (1998) book, which stemmed from a conference in Britain in 1992. In this book, oppressive,

empowering and contradictions within representations of femininity in early modern writing by women and men are exposed as texts are deconstructed through close readings. At times, the chapters also refer to broader cultural and, albeit to a much lesser extent, economic contexts.

Although keeping a focus on identity, Foxhall and Salmon (1998) and Allwood (1998) are concerned with masculinity. The entries in Foxhall and Salmon's (1998) book examine the shifting representations of masculinity that circulated and congealed within the particular historical contexts set by classical antiquity. In contrast to the seemingly Foucauldian influence exhibited by a least a number of the entries in this text, Allwood (1998) explicitly writes against poststructuralist approaches, specifically, in the form of those associated with Luce Irigaray, Helene Cixous and Julia Kristeva. Drawing heavily on the work of French materialist feminists, the author seeks to correct the mis-representation of French feminism in British and North American feminist writings as being almost solely associated with the approaches of these three thinkers and aims to provide a (non-Marxist) historical materialist feminist investigation of masculinity.

Differences in theoretical tendencies do appear to be evident between the two books just mentioned. However, drawn from a conference held in Britain in 1996 focusing on feminist approaches to law, the entries in McGlynn's (1998) text collectively exhibit evidence of being underpinned by a variety of theoretical approaches, including those that might be viewed as either more poststructuralist or more historical materialist. Likewise, Adam (1998) mixes a variety of feminist approaches, including those associated with feminist standpoint epistemology and feminist empiricism, with postmodern views of language, including Lacanian, Foucauldian and Derridean poststructuralist approaches, during her critical realist exploration of the masculine bias in Artificial Intelligence. Finally, perhaps, best viewed as an anomaly,¹ Robinson's (1998) text, first published in 1799, appears to

¹ This book is a facsimile reprint of a text that was originally published in 1799. I have decided to include it in the sample for 1998 because reprinted works were not excluded by the original criteria set for the research (Ch.2). However, since the book is part of a series of reprints (*Revolution and Romanticism, 1789-1834* selected by Johnathon Wordsworth), which was put together by a male and does not appear to be explicitly feminist in its reach, it might be prudent to regard the book

endorse an 'equality in difference' perspective between women and men in the domestic sphere but argues for women's access to the type of education that would allow them to demonstrate their mental ability to participate in political life with men.

5.22: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives

In contrast to the expected results for 1980, poststructuralist influences (stressing the internal workings of discourse) rather than historical materialist ones (stressing social relations) are predicted to be the most dominant perspectives in the 1998 sample. In this sub-section, therefore, I will consider the texts in each journal in turn followed by the books in relation to Hypothesis One. To aid my reflections and to begin to compare the 1980 and 1998 British sample, the 1998 texts will be read against those in the 1980 sample. While it will become clear that there has been a significant rise in the influence of poststructuralist insights, I will suggest that there is insufficient evidence to confirm Hypothesis One.

Reading the 1998 British journal sample against the 1980 British journal sample, I believe it is immediately evident that it is less clear that the 1998 journals as a whole can be seen to be tending towards one of two 'camps' in the 'Big Four'- namely, radical or socialist feminism, as outlined in Chapter Three. Among the texts in *Feminist Review*, the dominant collective concern with trying to think through how feminism can use Marx in a manner that remains relatively faithful to his historical materialist method has disappeared. Instead of this collective concern, a variety of approaches are evident. Admittedly, Spence (1998) seems to be trying to extend Marx's notion of historical materialism. However, while certainly referring to the material activities of women, Prohovnick (1998) appears to be more influenced by liberal 'equality in difference' approaches, with differences recognised among men and among women rather than simply between women and men

and Breitenbach et al. (1998) seem to be influenced by a mixture of postcolonial arguments relating to cultural domination and non-materialist radical feminist arguments about men. For Smyth (1998) and Attwood (1998) the internal workings of shifting discourses seem to be the primary focus. Thus, when these two texts are set alongside Breitenbach et al.'s (1998) at least partially postcolonial influenced text, the balance does appear to be tipped slightly towards poststructuralist dominance. However, given the very small number of sample texts in this journal I do not believe it is possible to say that there is firm evidence to confirm Hypothesis One here.

In *Women's Studies International Forum*, a number of the authors are still clearly interested in examining ideas, which I argued was the dominant linking theme of the 1980 texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. However, as I suggested during my descriptions above, the overall concern with large, undifferentiated systems of ideas that act upon women in general has disappeared. Certainly, I believe that there is evidence of poststructuralist influences in a number of the 1998 texts. Although not restricted to it (e.g. Epstein & Steinberg, 1998), poststructuralism as a positive influence is particularly noticeable in the special issue, here bearing particular evidence of postcolonial forms of poststructuralism. Yet, in texts that are attacking the dominant position it is claimed to hold, there is also evidence of poststructuralism as a negative influence (e.g. Doy, 1998, Oakley, 1998).

As in the majority of texts just mentioned, the influence of the insights associated with Black feminism or multiracial feminism is evident in a number of others (e.g. Birke & Whitworth, 1998; Dhaliwal, 1998; Raghuram & Hardhill, 1998, Bhopal, 1998). These additional texts are also concerned with ideas, specifically, in the form of Islam. By setting these ideas within specific contexts containing other structures, with which they interact and which women act within, there is a greater feeling of historical materialist influences that are more non-Marxist than strictly Marxist in orientation in these texts. Though this is less evident in the Birke and Whitworth text. I would suggest this feeling also arises out of a number of other texts (e.g. Bond & Bywaters, 1998; Kerr 1998; Andrew & Montague,

1998; Hardhill & MacDonald, 1998). In addition, aspects of specific texts appear to reveal the influences of other perspectives mixed into their approaches, including standpoint feminism (e.g. Kerr, 1998), the type of women-centredness often associated with some forms of cultural feminism (e.g. Andrew & Montague, 1998) and radical feminism (e.g. Bond & Bywaters, 1998; Hague, 1998).

Overall, then, dominance in this journal does seem to be tipped towards the general influence of Black or multiracial feminism. However, with specific regard to the lens set by Hypothesis One, it is also apparent that there is a noticeable rise in poststructuralist influences when the 1998 sample texts are compared to the 1980 ones. Nevertheless, I believe that most of the texts with positive poststructuralist influences are contained within one special issue and drawn from one conference with a particular theme. Interestingly, it seems that many of the 1998 texts in this journal are actually more influenced by historical materialist insights than most of those in this journal were in the 1980 British sample. Therefore, given my understanding of the way the majority of texts outside of the special issue seem to approach ideas, it is tempting to suggest that historical materialism is the more generally dominant perspective in the 1998 British texts in this journal. This is a form of historical materialism that is more non-Marxist than strictly Marxist in orientation and articulated in non-universalist ways.

It will become evident below that historical materialist influences are not absent from the 1998 British books. However, I believe that the sense of struggle about how to use Marx that seemed to arise from a number of the 1980 British books is much less evident in the 1998 books. In addition, as is apparent from some of the texts in *Feminist Review* and many of those in *Women's Studies International Forum*, the rise in influence of the insights generally associated with Black or multiracial feminism, regardless of their specific philosophical underpinnings, is striking. These particular influences are immediately visible in texts by Chant and McIlwaine (1998), Haw (1998), Ghousoub (1998), Charles and Hintjens (1998) and Yeo (1998) but certainly not restricted to them.

As among the journals, the rise in the number of texts that bear evidence of being particularly heavily influenced by poststructuralism in a positive way is highly visible when the 1998 books are compared to the 1980 ones. For example, positive poststructuralist influences are evident in books by Haw (1998), Yeo (1998), Chedgzoy and Hansen (1998), Foxhall and Salmon, (1998) and, although, demonstrating some ambivalence towards postmodernist views, Ghoussoub (1998). In contrast, poststructuralism as a negative influence is acutely visible in Allwood's (1998) text, which advocates non-Marxist forms of historical materialist approaches. Just as Allwood (1998) regards masculinity as a product of social relations that emerge within contexts that are shaped by non-discursive types of material structures, at least two other texts bear evidence of tending more towards historical materialist forms of explanations than poststructuralist ones (Chant & McIlwaine, 1998; Charles & Hintjens, 1998). Although not exclusively so, both of these texts tend more towards Marxist forms of historical materialism than Allwood's (1998) book does.

The texts mentioned above do seem to tend more towards one of either side of the hypothesis. However, I believe that a reasonably even distribution of poststructuralist and more historical materialist approaches are apparent between the chapters in McGlynn's (1998) book. Here, these approaches are presented in a manner that does not suggest great tensions exist between advocates of either approach. Furthermore, Adam's (1998) text reveals a deliberate attempt to mix historical materialist and poststructuralist approaches among others.

As with the journals, the general rise in texts that exhibit evidence of being influenced by Black feminism or feminism associated with women of colour is immediately evident in the books. Regarding Hypothesis One, the rise in poststructuralist influence that has taken place since 1980 is also evident. In addition, it seems that the sense of heated debate about how to mix Marxism and feminism has somewhat abated, even when taking Allwood's (1980) text into consideration. Nevertheless, as I have argued, historical materialism has far from disappeared. Yet, overall, if the books that include mixings of

both historical materialism and poststructuralism or criticisms of poststructuralism are added to those in which poststructuralism is the main positive influence then I believe that the balance in the book sample seems to be tipped towards poststructuralist dominance.

My arguments about the 1998 sample in relation to Hypothesis One can be thus summarised: I have suggested that in contrast to the dominance of historical materialist perspectives in the 1980 texts in *Feminist Review*, the 1998 texts seem to tip towards poststructuralist dominance. However, given the small number of texts in the sample from this journal I did not believe that there was enough evidence to confirm that poststructuralism is actually dominant. In *Women's Studies International Forum*, the 1998 texts reveal a significant increase in the number of texts in which poststructuralist insights are evident when compared to the 1980 British texts. However, because the majority of the 1998 texts in which these perspectives are visible were published in one issue and the dominant perspective in texts published outside this issue appeared to have a more historical materialist flavour, I did not believe that there was firm evidence to confirm Hypothesis One. Finally, in the book sample it was clear that historical materialism is influencing some of the 1998 texts. Yet when compared to the 1980 book sample, the rise in the number of books that are influenced by poststructuralist insights in some manner was significant. This rise in influence, therefore, led me to suggest that poststructuralist perspectives are the most dominant ones in the 1998 book sample. Nevertheless, taking the sample as a whole, while poststructuralist insights have clearly increased when compared to the 1980 sample, I do not believe that there is enough evidence to confirm that these perspectives are dominant. More generally, as I have argued throughout my reflections on Hypothesis One, compared to the 1980 British sample, there has been an enormous increase in texts in which the influence of the insights associated with Black feminism or women of colour is evident.

5.23: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts

In the second hypothesis, the content of the 1998 British texts is expected to be more oriented towards addressing cultural issues such as those pertaining to language, representation, symbolisation and discourse rather than concrete material social and economic issues. Additionally texts are expected to be seeking ways to understand and analyse the oppression of individual women and their personal responses to it rather than describing and analysing women's oppression as a collective issue that requires collective responses to end it. Differences between the 1980 and 1998 texts will become apparent during the course of my reflections, but I will be led to suggest that both parts of Hypothesis Two remain unconfirmed.

In the last chapter, I argued that, although many of the specific issues addressed in the 1980 texts in *Feminist Review* could be viewed as being cultural ones, material issues were in fact the key concern when these specific issues were placed within the context of the authors' overall arguments. In this light, all of the 1998 texts in this journal can be regarded as containing issues that might be viewed as material when regarded in the abstract, for example, work (e.g. Spence, 1998; Prohovnick, 1998; Breitenbach et al., 1998), sexual relationships (Attwood, 1998) and abortion (Smyth, 1998). However, the question here is whether the primary concern of the authors' can be viewed as more cultural or material when these specific issues are placed within their larger contexts.

It would seem that for two of the five texts in this journal it is the material activities of women and men that are the key issue in as much as they appear to form the base out of which ideas and attitudes arise (Spence, 1998; Prohovnick, 1998). However, by focussing on discourses of abortion (Smyth, 1998) and femininity and sexuality (Attwood, 1998) and speaking of material oppression as an effect of cultural and political domination (Breitenbach et al., 1998), the remaining texts seem to tend towards cultural issues as being the primary concern. Therefore, the dominant underlying concern with material issues that was apparent in the 1980 *Feminist Review* texts appears to be less evident in

the 1998 ones. Nevertheless given that there is only a slightly uneven split between the 1998 texts and the small numbers in the sample from this journal I do not believe that there is firm evidence to suggest that the first part of Hypothesis Two is confirmed in *Feminist Review*.

Certainly, it is possible to identify a much greater concern with differences existing between women in the 1998 texts when they are read against the 1980 *Feminist Review* texts. However, I do not believe that there is strong evidence to confirm that individualist orientations are dominant. Prohovnick's (1998) tendency to accept rather than challenge differences between activities carried out by individual women as well as individual men and Attwood's (1998) stressing of the multiple shifting identities of women resulting from their individual discursive practices do seem to tend towards an individualist orientation. In the remaining texts, there is a desire to understand differences among women, and between different groups of women, without losing sight of their connectedness to a larger whole. In short, the orientation of these three remaining texts appears to be a collectivist one that is sensitive to difference.

As I have already suggested above, a large number of the 1998 British texts in *Women's Studies International Forum* do share the cultural concerns of the British texts in the 1980 issues of *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. Specifically this is so in terms of ideas about women. However, I would argue that there are differences between the 1980 and 1998 texts in terms of how these concerns are addressed. With the exception of Evans (1980a), most of the 1980 texts that address ideas seemed to be concerned with the negative effects of ideas about women that women themselves seemed to play little part in producing. Indeed, what appeared to be advocated in a number of the 1980 texts was women's greater participation in the production of ideas, since their ideas would, presumably, have a counter effect on the oppressive largely, internally undifferentiated ideological system associated with patriarchy. Yet, in the 1998 texts, there appears to be more of a focus on multiple types of ideas that are simultaneously produced by and producing women.

With the exception of Doy (1998), the primary focus of the authors in the special issue, *Women, Imperialism and Identity*, seems to be examining the construction of hierarchical differences among women as well as between men and women in discourses produced by women. In addition, Epstein and Steinburg (1998) are concerned with the construction of hierarchical difference along multiple lines within one dominant discursive identity that is both challenged and reinforced by other discourses. Nevertheless, it is a focus on culture that lacks sustained concern with the constraining effects of a broader context containing both material and ideological structures that appears to be under attack in Doy (1998) and Oakley's (1998) texts.

Some of the specific issues that are addressed in the remaining texts can be regarded as cultural ones. These issues include, women's decision making (Bond & Bywaters, 1998), women's interpretation of HIV-positive diagnosis (Crossley, 1998), women scientists' ways of knowing (Kerr, 1998), meaning making as a collectively negotiated process (Wilkinson, 1998) the interaction of different value systems producing differences in women's active understanding of science (Birke & Whitworth, 1998) and women's friendship (Andrew & Montague, 1998). Certainly, some of specific issues that are analysed in the remaining texts can be regarded as material ones, for example, women and paid work (Andrew & Montague, 1998; Raghuram & Hardhill, 1998; Macdonald & Hardhill, 1998; Dhaliwal, 1998) motherhood and child care arrangements (Bhopal, 1998) and domestic violence (Hague, 1998). Yet, in by far the majority of these remaining texts, I believe that there is greater evidence of a concern with broader contexts that contain both material and ideological structures and provide the framework within which the specific issues arise and take on their particular shape. Therefore, when looked at collectively, I do not believe that there is firm evidence to suggest that the texts in this journal are more concerned with cultural issues than with material ones.

In terms of the second part of Hypothesis Two, as I suggested earlier, the 1998 texts in this journal display much more evidence of a concern with differences among women than the 1980 texts, particularly, although not exclusively, in terms of 'race' and ethnicity. In

addition, there is more evidence of a concern with individual women's agency in the 1998 texts. By focussing on the activities of particular women, whether in terms of their negotiation of contexts that contain material and ideological structures or their participation in constructing ideas by which they are also shaped, a number of the texts could appear to be swinging dangerously close to an individualist outlook. Nevertheless, these contexts are viewed as constraining as well as enabling women's agency, albeit in ways that produce differences as well as similarities among women, suggesting that women's agency is not regarded as being exercised freely. Therefore, rather than texts being either individualist or collectivist in their outlook, it seems that that the dominant concerns in this journal are the tensions between these two alternatives.

In the book sample, it would appear that cultural issues are key features of a number of the texts. Here, there are, for example, close textual analyses of representations of femininity in early modern writing (Chedgzoy & Hansen, 1998), analyses of discourses of femininity about and reworked by British women (Yeo, 1998), an examination of different discourses incorporated and resisted by Muslim girls (Haw, 1998) and explorations of representations of masculinity in classical antiquity (Foxhall & Salmon, 1998). In addition, ideas about truth and relativism form key foci for both Adam (1998) and Ghoussoub (1998).

With the possible exception of Adam (1998), who mixes cultural and material concerns in her approach to the knowing subject, all of the books just mentioned are linked by their primary concern with identity. With the exception of Ghoussoub (1998), identity here appears to be treated most dominantly as a discursive affair. Yet the linking of identity to material social relations detectable within the work of Ghoussoub (1998), becomes much more of a central feature in the explorations of ethnic identities in Charles and Hintjens' book (1998) and Allwood's (1998) investigation of masculinity.

The focus on mixing material and cultural issues that is evident within the analyses of identity in Charles and Hintjens' (1998) and Allwood's (1998) texts can also be seen in at

least some of the contributions in McGlynn's (1998) text that address legislation and women working in the legal profession. Additionally a mixture of material and cultural concerns is evident in Chant and McIlwaine's (1998) cross-cultural examination of the changing experiences of men and women and their attitudes about issues such as work, education and family life. However, for Plowden (1998), the material activities of women within the context of war are of central importance.

When compared to the 1980 British books, I believe that a greater proportion of the 1998 books tend to keep their analyses at the level of culture. Nevertheless, I do not believe that there is evidence to suggest that a focus on 'words' is actually more dominant than a focus on 'things' in the 1998 books when they are looked at collectively. Certainly, as in a number of the 1998 journal articles, there is evidence to suggest that identity is a key topic. However, as I hope I have shown, it is only by placing specific issues within the broader context of texts that one can decide whether the primary concerns are material or cultural, or, as suggested by a number of the books, a mixture of both.

As with the journal texts, when the 1998 books are looked at collectively and compared to those in the 1980 British sample there is a much greater feeling of sensitivity towards difference among women, particularly, although not exclusively, in terms of 'race', ethnicity and nationality (e.g. Yeo, 1998; Haw, 1998; Goussoub, 1998; Chant & McIlwaine, 1998; Charles & Hintjens, 1998). In addition, whether articulated in the form of self-regulation (Haw, 1998), writing by individual women, as in some of the chapters in Yeo (1998) and Chedgzoy and Hansen (1998), or the activities of individual women during the Civil War in England (Plowden, 1998), aspects of some of the texts highlight the agency of individual women.

Nevertheless, while many of the British 1998 books certainly acknowledge that gender manifests itself differently within and between different times and places and that it is cross-cut by other forms of stratification, I do not believe this represents the notion that gender is simply an individual affair. Instead, by recognising differences among women as

well as women's agency, and, as is evident within at least two books (Allwood, 1998; Foxhall & Salmon, 1998), some of the contradictions within masculinity, what arises is a struggle to understand the connections as well as the tensions among women and among men. Overall, a sense arises from the 1998 sample as a whole that the world is viewed as more complicated than it was in the 1980 sample, yet despite this, something that can be labelled as gender inequality persists. Therefore, much more so than in 1980, the problem in 1998 appears to be discovering how to understand and articulate gender inequality as a collective issue in a manner that is sensitive to differences among women and among men.

To sum up my arguments for the 1998 British sample in relation to the first part of Hypothesis Two I will draw together my conclusions from each part of the sample. In contrast to my reflections on the 1980 *Feminist Review* texts, where I suggested that material issues dominate as the primary concern, the 1998 texts revealed a slightly uneven split between those exhibiting a primary concern with cultural issues and a primary concern with material issues. Yet, given the low numbers of texts in the 1998 sample from this journal, I am reluctant to suggest that this provides firm evidence to confirm that cultural issues are more dominant than material issues in *Feminist Review* in 1998. Despite a few exceptions (e.g. Allen, 1980; Leman, 1980; Baehr, 1980; Booth, 1980), I suggested that the dominant key concern linking the majority of the 1980 British texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* is cultural, particularly in the form of sexist ideas, norms, values and stereotypes. In the 1998 texts in this journal I suggested that there are a number of texts, particularly, but not exclusively, within the special issue, in which the primary focus of the analysis is kept at the level of discourse, therefore, revealing a cultural emphasis. Yet, since within the majority of the remaining texts the primary focus represents a mixing of cultural and material concerns, I do not believe that there is firm evidence to suggest that cultural issues alone are more dominant in this journal.

In the 1980 books, I argued that the dominant primary concern of the cluster of books linked together by their apparent collective concern with issues related to using Marx in some way is material. In addition, I suggested that the majority of the remaining texts seem to exhibit a mixture of cultural and material tendencies within their analyses. In contrast, I stated that the 1998 books contained a cluster of texts where the primary concern of the analyses seems to be kept at the level of culture. I nevertheless suggested that the dominant concerns within the majority of the remaining texts again seem to exhibit a mixture of cultural and material tendencies. Therefore, I was reluctant to claim that the specific content and focus of the 1980 British texts was oriented more towards material rather than cultural issues. Likewise, with the 1998 British sample, there does not appear to be firm evidence to indicate that cultural issues are actually the more dominant concern.

In terms of the second part of Hypothesis Two, I suggested that a collectivist outlook dominates in the 1980 British sample as a whole, which confirmed what was expected for the 1980 texts. This suggestion was based on my arguments that, on the whole, it is women as members of a unified group who are being addressed and that political action, where discussed, tends to be articulated in a fashion suggesting collective action is required against an oppression caused by the relatively internally undifferentiated systems of capitalism, patriarchy or both together. However, contrary to what was expected for the 1998 texts, I did not conclude that the dominant outlook is individualist. Certainly, I have argued that within the 1998 sample there are more texts that are concerned with differences among women than there are in the 1980 sample. In addition, there does seem to be more stress on the agency of particular women whether as individuals or as members of a particular group of women in the 1998 British sample. However, whether the concern with differences among women and women's agency actually equates to an individualistic outlook is, perhaps, the question that I have been struggling with during my consideration of this part of the hypothesis in relation to the 1998 texts. With some exceptions, mainly among a few of the texts exhibiting poststructuralist tendencies, I have concluded that the heightened concern with difference and agency does not automatically

represent an individualist outlook but rather a desire to understand the tensions between an individualist and a collectivist outlook.

5.3: The 1998 USA Sample: Descriptions and Hypotheses One and Two

In this section I will focus on the 1998 USA sample texts. I will begin with a brief description of each text falling in the sample. Following this, I will consider the texts in relation to Hypotheses One and Two.

5.31: Descriptions

The qualifying texts for the 1998 USA sample totalled fifty-nine journal contributions and twenty-one books. Of the journal contributions, twelve were from *Women's Studies International Forum*, twenty-three were from *Feminist Studies* and twenty-four were from *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society*. Of the book sample, fourteen were single author books, three were single edited books and four were joint-edited books. The bibliographic details for the 1998 USA sample texts appear in Appendix IV. To allow for comparisons to be made between the different journals under consideration and the book sample, I will begin by describing the content of each separately.

5.311: *Women's Studies International Forum*

In contrast to the 1998 British sample, none of the twelve texts from *Women's Studies International Forum* qualifying for the 1998 USA sample were published in the special issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity*. Yet, not totally unlike the British sample, where none of the texts were published in the second special issue, *Migrating Feminisms: the Asia Pacific Region*, only one of the USA texts was published in the second special issue. Given the locations of the conferences from which these two special issues stemmed -

Britain and Australia respectively - the lack of USA sample texts in the special issues is, perhaps, unsurprising.

Just as with the 1980 USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, a dominant linking theme throughout a number of the 1998 USA texts in this journal seems to be a concern with representation in some form. Nevertheless, in at least the majority of the 1998 texts, there is much more evidence of a greater concern with differences among women and, within many of these particular texts, a greater stress on women's agency. These general concerns, therefore, seem similar to those that I suggested were apparent in the 1998 British texts from this journal.

As with a number of the 1998 British texts in *Women's Studies International Forum*, particularly, but not, exclusively those published in the special issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity*, a concern with identity appears to run through many of the 1998 USA texts. Taking issue with ableism in the women's movement, sexism in the disability movement and stressing the need to challenge oppressive stereotypes, Ferri and Gregg (1998) highlight the need for greater understanding of how disabilities impact in their various ways upon gender identity in particular social contexts. Emphasising the multiple, internal contradictions within the identities negotiated by individuals in specific contexts, Woolacott (1998) examines official reports written by British women in the First World War and Kauanui (1998) criticises the recent impetus to acknowledge a unified and unitary notion of Hawaiian national identity.

Stressing the multiple and shifting identities of individual women as well as the notion of difference among women within and overtime, Dodds (1998) considers the perceptions and attitudes of eighteen East German women five years after German re-unification. For Soh (1980), it is more firmly differences between women's experiences that appear to be highlighted during her exploration of textual depictions of three women's experiences as 'comfort women' during the Second World War. Here, these differences are regarded as arising out of the ways intersections of 'race', class and gender affect women differently.

Yet, although acknowledging the multiple identities of four professional Native American women, Brayboy and Morgan (1998) identify themes from interviews in order to enhance understanding of not only the individuality of each woman's experiences but also their commonality with each other and with women from different ethnic groups.

Continuing the concern with 'race' and ethnicity, Davis (1998) highlights depression among African American women as an under-researched area. She views their depression as the result of social and economic inequalities and describes how the women she interviewed draw on inner 'creative essences' as individual responses to it. In addition, Uchida (1980) examines the oppressive, homogenising discourses of Orientalization circulating in images of Asian-American women in the USA and considers their affects on Asian-American women's identity and Asian-American women's resistance to them.

Just as Uchida (1998), Jenefsky and Miller (1998) are concerned with images of women. More specifically, they attempt to expose how 'lesbian' images in *Penthouse* magazine reinforce heterosexuality and dominant notions of a stable (heterosexual) gender identity. Focussing more broadly on the social construction of the women's movement by the media, Gilmartin and Brunn (1998) are equally critical of images. The authors expose how the delegates and issues addressed at the 1995 World Conference on Women in Beijing were trivialised and marginalised in political cartoons in the United States, which they claim tended to focus dominant attention on politics relating to the host country.

The World Conference on Women in Beijing also forms a context for Raymond (1998) who is concerned with the inadequacies of the definition of violence against women informing the *Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action*. These inadequacies are exposed as resulting from non-governmental organisations' continued refusal to define all forms of prostitution as violence. Finally, government legislation, its shaping by specific cultures and the reshaping of those specific cultures in its working out, is the focus for

Kampwirth's (1998) examination of the shifting positions of the Sandinista Front in its legislation relating to sexuality and reproduction in Nicaragua between 1979 and 1992.

5.312: Feminist Studies

When the 1998 *Feminist Studies* texts are compared to the 1980 ones, the specific issues under scrutiny appear to have shifted somewhat. Notably this is in terms of the apparent absence of a concern with injecting feminist insights into Marx's historical materialist analysis of capitalism in order to develop a socialist feminist *theory* of women's oppression. However, as I will demonstrate below, the self reflective tone of a number of the 1980 *Feminist Studies* texts, in terms of contemplating on academic feminism itself, is evident in a large number of the 1998 texts in this journal. Several of the 1998 *Feminist Studies* texts have a self-reflective character. Undoubtedly this is partly due to the nature of one special issue, *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies*². The special issue contained nine of this journal's twenty-three qualifying texts and was devoted to considering issues relating to intellectual debates and institutional concerns, particularly (although not exclusively) in relation to the development of Women's Studies PhD programmes in North America. Nevertheless, self-reflection, in the forms of assessing where academic feminism is intellectually and considering its relation to direct engagement with political activism, also seems to be central to a number of the texts outside the special issue.

While issues surrounding the development of Women's Studies PhD programmes do not appear to be central to two of the qualifying texts in the special issue, self-reflection on academic feminism certainly does. Moses' (1998) concerns bear similarities to those raised by Allwood (1998) in the 1998 British book sample in as much as they focus on the misrepresentation of French feminism outside France, namely, as a body of thought dominated by poststructuralist orientated thinkers. Focussing on the USA context, Moses (1998) links this misrepresentation to the selective nature of translated works that were

introduced by US French literature specialists during the late 1970s and early 1980s and the current overrepresentation of literature specialists within Women's Studies in the USA. Yet, on a far less critical note, McDermott's (1998) general overview of introductory Women's Studies textbooks highlights developments within the production of academic texts and stresses how introductory texts allow students to collectively reflect on and debate the historical and contemporary meaning and practical concerns of feminism.

For the remaining seven texts in the special issue concerns and debates related, although, not necessarily restricted, to the development of Women's Studies doctoral programmes in North America in the 1990s appear to be more central. Here, for example, texts include debates about the extent to which the concept of interdisciplinarity is possible and desirable within feminist knowledge (e.g. Allen & Kitch, 1998; Freidman, 1998). Other texts consider whether Women's Studies PhD programmes should be autonomous or developed jointly with other academic departments (e.g. Stewart, 1998; Herman & Smith, 1998; Yee, 1998; Bowen, 1998; Boxer, 1998a). In addition, addressing recent moves towards the introduction of PhD programmes as well as Women's Studies in general, Guy-Sheftall (1998a) demonstrates particular concern about the relatively low number of non-white academic staff within Women's Studies and the need for greater integration of non-white and more global perspectives within the content of Women's Studies courses.

'Race' continues to be a central concern in a number of texts addressing recent welfare reforms in the USA. In particular, these texts address the way 'race' intersects with class. Williams and Peterson (1998) analyse representations of citizenship to show how recent welfare reforms and the retrenchment of affirmative action programmes are linked to 19th Century racialized discourses of citizenship. In addition, a cluster of articles that are introduced by Boris (1998) and written by members of the Women's Committee of 100, which formed in 1995 to protest against welfare reforms, continue the concern with social

² The title on the back cover of the special issue is, *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies*. On the *Feminist Studies* website: www.feministstudies.org/issueset.htm it appears as *The*

policy (Kittay, 1998; Kombluh, 1998; Michel, 1998; Mink 1998). Yet, the self-reflective tone of academic feminism is, perhaps, more explicitly evident in these particular articles than in Williams and Peterson's (1998) text. Indeed, as well as highlighting more general issues such as women participating in other women's oppression by supporting welfare reform (Mink, 1998), the apparent lack of widespread organised opposition (Kombluh, 1998; Mink, 1998) and the middle-class orientation of much activist feminism (Kittay, 1998), the need for stronger links to be forged between feminist scholarship and grass-roots activism, especially on issues relating to poor women, appears to be emphasised throughout these articles.

A concern with economic issues links Nelson and Smith's (1998) article to the texts just mentioned. Nelson and Smith (1998) examine the effects of recent economic restructuring in the USA on the pattern of activities carried out by men and women inside and outside the home and men and women's perceptions of their respective positionings within the family. Sharing Guy-Sheftall's (1998a) views about the need for globalist perspectives, Booth (1998) focuses on the World Health Organisation's Global Program on Aids decision to pay specific attention to women who were either HIV-positive or at risk from AIDS in the early 1990s. Here, the author takes issue with the fact that internationalist solutions, which were designed to protect national sovereignty, rather than globalist strategies were adopted. Minnich (1998) applies Mink's (1998) concern about women oppressing women to academic feminism itself. Highlighting the patriarchal nature of four recent 'feminist' books by Sommers (1994), Patai and Koertge (1994), Fox-Genovese (1996) and Roiphe (1993), she claims that their central concerns are attacking feminist knowledge and practice.

Keeping the spotlight on academic feminism, Hausman (1998) demonstrates concern about the problems persisting in the articulation of the materiality of sex in recent feminist theories of the body. Thus, through a reading of Charlotte Perkins Gilman's *Herland* she attempts to provide an alternative pathway where 'sex' rather than 'gender' is privileged in

feminist analyses. Similarly, the body is central to McLerran's (1998) article. Heavily influenced by Foucault and theorists mixing his approach with Lacanian psychoanalysis, McLerran (1998) considers the discursive shaping of the body during an analysis of Jana Sterbak's art.

The remaining articles in *Feminist Studies* appear to share a concern with identity. Polier's (1998) analysis of the life narrative provided by a Papuan migrant woman presents her subject as a unique, complex individual by stressing the multiple, shifting and contradictory nature of her identity. Newton (1998) focuses on recent scholarly work on masculinity. Whilst appearing to be fairly positive about the recent work she reviews, she nevertheless believes that studies on masculinity need to include greater consideration of femininity and 'race' and to be more specific in their focus. Finally, focussing on female masculinities, Doan (1998) throws current assumptions about dress codes and same-sex desire into question by describing how the 1920s widespread, generally acceptable fashion for women to dress in trouser suits and neck ties and crop their hair was not interpreted as an indicator of same-sex desire.

5.313: Signs

The 1998 issues of *Signs* contained one special issue, *Feminisms and Youth Cultures*, in which eight of the twenty-four qualifying texts from this journal were published. Just as was evident in many of the texts in the 1980 sample from this journal, representation in some form appears to be a central concern of a number of the 1998 texts. However, in contrast, while some of the 1980 texts in this journal did demonstrate a concern with differences among women, this sensitivity is much more central to many of the 1998 texts. There is also a heightened concern with women's agency as it is exercised within specific contexts. This concern is particularly evident in the special issue, although it is not restricted to it.

Admittedly, Esquibel's (1998) exploration of the literary construction of lesbian desire in Chicana fiction seems to locate agency firmly within the text itself rather than the sexuality

of the authors or characters. However, the construction of young women and girls by representations they actively create appears to be central to a number of the texts in the special issue. Here, for example, in contrast to views that suggest schools simply indoctrinate docile pupils with dominant ideas about cultural identity, Porter (1998) examines young girls' symbolic acts of resistance to these ideas in a school in Kenya. In addition, Bing-Canar and Zerkel (1998) describe how a group of young Arab American women actively challenged dominant ideas about themselves by producing a video on their lives and their community.

The construction of identity through video making also forms the focus for Carter (1998) who examines the autobiographical work of a young lesbian video artist that reflects on her life in relation to cultural influences around her. For Wald (1998), female rock bands form the focus. She exposes these bands as potentially challenging yet, at the same time, reinforcing dominant ideas about femininity and highlights differences between bands in different geographical locations in terms of the discourses of girlhood they draw on and shape.

In Rosenberg and Garofalo's (1998) article, members of Riot Grrrl³ express their views about the Riot Grrrl community, which is described as a safe space for young women to discuss and challenge dominant ideas. O'Neil (1998), who is the director of a young-women's only organisation, highlights the need for sensitivity to differences among women and the need to address inequalities among women as structural issues to be challenged. In addition, she urges adult women to respect young women's ability to exercise agency and treat them as equals. Yet, although still seeming to stress young girls' agency, Projansky (1998) explores the process of recuperation occurring within various media discourses following the death of a seven-year old girl pilot whose actions did not appear to conform to dominant discourses of girlhood.

Still focussing on the media, Shih (1998) analyses depictions of Mainland Chinese women in media productions directed at audiences in Hong Kong and Taiwan. In so doing, she challenges claims about the emergence of a new pan-Chinese culture and identity spanning Mainland China, Hong Kong and Taiwan that is driven by economic integration. Turning the spotlight onto ideas about masculinity, Fehrenbach (1998) and Poiger's (1998) articles form part of a forum on the redefinition of German masculine identity after the Second World War. Fehrenbach (1998) stresses the importance of ideas about the loving and protective father in social policy discourse and Poiger (1998) emphasises the importance of cultural representations and the influence of American cultural products, particularly western films, in the process of this redefinition. Summarising this forum, Jeffords (1998) encourages the production of comparative work focussing on the differences and similarities between German and US masculinities.

Hegland (1998), Joseph (1998) and Mayer's (1998) articles are concerned with Muslim women. Responding to an (non-qualifying) article exploring the relationship of feminism to Islam (Majid, 1998), Hegland (1998) calls for greater recognition of differences within Islam, whilst Joseph (1998) questions assumptions that Muslim women must place the Islamic struggle against Western capitalist oppressors above achieving women's rights. Mayer (1998) emphasises the contradictions within North-West Pakistani Muslim women's mourning rituals. These rituals are regarded as providing women with opportunities for self-development but also increasing the constraints placed upon them because of the women's growing commitment to fundamentalist ideas.

Sensitivity to differences among women continues as a theme in Landsman's (1998) article. Here, the author explores the ways that women with small children with disabilities engage in the process of constructing motherhood. In addition, Kaufman's (1998) account of the friendship between two writers, Dominique Aury and Edith Thomas, highlights the women's strong commitment to each other despite the differences between them and

³ Riot Grrrl is a group of young, primarily white middle/upper girls women that was set up in 1991 and originally intended to increase female involvement in the punk scene in Washington D.C.

likens their situation to contemporary feminism as it searches for a sense of unity among women that does not erase differences.

James (1998) turns the spotlight more specifically onto academic feminism. She criticises Western feminists' attacks on harmful practices that are carried out on women in African cultures, particularly female circumcision, for invariably neglecting the historical and cultural contexts of these practices and ignoring the agency that African women exercise against patriarchal institutions. In addition, Oyewumi (1998) and Foster (1998) investigate inadequacies in feminist theories of gender. On the one hand, Foster (1998) calls for a focus on choreography rather than performance in theories of gender, thus, allowing the larger picture, rather than individual act, to enhance understanding of the body's construction through the interaction of the corporeal and the linguistic. On the other hand, Oyewumi (1998) locates the persisting problem of biological determinism that she claims is detectable within recent Western feminist theories of gender in their failure to take ideas from non-Western cultures into account.

Focussing on the more general academic community, Fleischman (1998) highlights the way the personal pronoun 'I' is more often found in scholarly work by women than that by men, exposes the way its use is often frowned upon and argues that academic writing conventions need to be re-evaluated. In addition, concerned with the abstract nature of much social policy analysis, Kou (1998) proposes a principle, labelled secondary or derivative discrimination, in which the consequences of specific policies are evaluated by considering their relationships to other laws and practices.

Finally, Rosser (1998) and Fox (1998) examine the under-representation of women in science and engineering. Highlighting the dominance of liberal ideas underpinning the few women in science and engineering projects that explicitly draw on feminist insights and the majority of those that do not, Rosser (1998) calls for the need for their increased use of other feminist perspectives. Concerned about the low number of female science and

engineering doctoral students, Fox (1998) considers the views about women in science that underpin specific graduate level courses and the particular solutions proposed to encourage more women to embark on and complete doctoral study.

5.314: Books

As with the British sample, I believe that one of the key differences that arises from the descriptions of the 1980 and 1998 USA journal sample is that there is a much stronger and consistent concern with 'race' and ethnicity in the 1998 texts. In line with my comments when describing the 1998 British book sample, I believe that this concern continues to thread its way through a number of the twenty-one books in the 1998 USA sample, despite differences in the particular foci of individual texts.

Notwithstanding differences in their approaches to the topic, two of the books that are concerned with 'race' and ethnicity are also linked by their focus on masculinity. This particular focus was evident within the USA 1998 journal sample (e.g. Newton, 1998; Fehrenbach, 1998; Poiger, 1998) and also the British 1998 book sample (e.g. Allwood, 1998; Foxhall & Salmon, 1998). Thus, drawing on empirical evidence, Myers (1998) challenges views that suggest the black family structure, in particular, families headed by a single black female, during early socialization rather than racism in the structures of the broader society is responsible for black men's higher rates of incarceration and lower levels of income and educational attainment compared to white men. In contrast to Myers' (1998) psycho-social empirical investigation of Black men in the USA, Nelson (1998) examines whiteness, in particular, the way it manifested itself in the ideology of national manhood in the USA. Drawing on a blend of Marxist, feminist and postcolonial perspectives, the author explores the historical congealing of this ideology within official documents, medical reviews and fiction.

Although retaining a focus on identity and demonstrating a concern with 'race' and ethnicity, the entries in Abu-Lugod's (1998) text fix their attention more firmly on femininity. Specifically, the book focuses on discourses about Middle Eastern women in the 19th and

20th Centuries. Appearing to be heavily influenced by Foucauldian discourse analysis and postcolonial theory throughout, individual chapters explore the ways in which these particular discourses arose out of the intersection of local discourses and Western colonial discourses of modernity. Entries in Feldhaus' (1998) text are also concerned with representations of femininity. The chapters in this book are seemingly influenced by a greater range of theoretical perspectives, with some appearing to contextualise their analyses within broader social and economic contexts more than others. Evolving from papers presented at a conference, *Images of Women and the Feminine in Maharashtra*, held in the USA in 1991 and drawing on historical documents, interview data and photographic evidence, chapters explore ideas about women in Maharashtra during the 18th, 19th and 20th Centuries.

Hahner's (1998) text contains a selection of writings about Latin American women by 19th Century European and US women travellers. The book is intended to encourage greater integration between literary critics using colonial discourse analysis, who focus on the authors of accounts, and historians, who tend to focus on the subjects of accounts during their analyses. Thus, Hahner (1998) encourages readers to reflect on and compare similarities and differences between the travel writers' self-representations that arise out of their depictions of their experiences and observations of Latin American women and the lives of the Latin American women these writers describe. Rogers (1998) retains the focus on representations of women in written texts. Yet, just as Nelson (1998), she is specifically concerned with national identity. Drawing heavily on Butler's poststructuralist influenced notion of performativity and arguing for the recognition of Ireland's postcolonial status, Rogers (1998) examines the multiple identities that arise in the performative discursive resistances of women within texts by two contemporary male Irish novelists. In so doing, she aims to demonstrate that there is no essential, unified Irish identity.

While not emphasising the fractured nature of identity, women's resistance is also a key theme in Coryell et al.'s (1998) book. Drawn from papers that were delivered at the *Third Southern Conference on Women's History* in the USA in 1994, entries in this text describe

a range of women in the 18th to 20th Centuries whose actions went against the popular stereotypical image of the white, middle-class, submissive Southern lady. On a perhaps related theme, Rothblum et al.'s (1998) text focuses on women and risk-taking, with particular concern for the ways in which women's experiences in the Antarctic affect their social and interpersonal relationships. Following a number of autobiographical accounts by women who had travelled to the Antarctic, chapters reflect on the implications of working in a predominantly male environment, the gendered nature of the Antarctic landscape and the importance of environmental and social contexts for the development of interpersonal relationships.

Lieberman (1998) returns to Rogers' (1998) concern with the discursive construction of identity. Influenced by feminist, postmodernist and psychoanalytic insights, she draws heavily on theories with poststructuralist tendencies during her close reading of a number of Chinese texts and exposes the multiplicity of ways that the mother figure is represented in them. In contrast, focussing on Chinese-American women, Ling (1998) is concerned with the experiences of real women rather than decontextualised, mainly fictional, textual depictions of them. During a socially, politically, culturally and economically situated historical study, the author explores the impact of racist, patriarchal and economic oppression on Chinese women immigrants, reflects on similarities and differences within this group of women over time and considers their experiences in relation to those of immigrant women from other countries.

Switching the focus onto Japanese women, Diggs (1998) aims to foster greater understanding of the former among women in the USA by reflecting on the differences and similarities of experiences in paid work and the home between Japanese women and women in the USA. Yet, addressing the historical development of women's studies in China, Hong Kong and Taiwan, Hershatter et al.'s (1998) book is intended to foster greater collaboration between feminist academics in the USA and those in these three jurisdictions.

Instead of focussing on a particular group of women or specific geographical region, Staudt (1998) situates her examination of women in international development within broader, global political and economic contexts. During her critical analysis of the structures and interaction within non-governmental organisations, national governments and international agencies and policies produced by these institutions, she emphasises the benefits of drawing on a mixture of feminist approaches. Although focussing on feminist literary criticism, Fay (1998), likewise, intends to introduce readers to a variety of theoretical perspectives, including those drawing on historical materialist and poststructuralist insights. In addition, entries in Longmire and Merrill's (1998) text display a diverse number of theoretical influences. Stemming from a conference, *Communication, Language, and Gender* in the USA, chapters address issues such as gendered patterns of communication in the workplace, home, and classroom, sexism in male generics and grammatical structures in language, sexism in novels and the media and empowerment.

Staudt (1998), Fay (1998) and Longmire and Merrill's (1998) texts seem to demonstrate that a broader vision of the topic under consideration can be gained when it is analysed from many different perspectives. However, Walker (1998) attempts to mix a number of perspectives in order to produce a single, new theoretical model and is thus critical of the male bias in the dominant model of morality and moral theory. She is influenced, in part, by Foucault and a variety of feminist epistemological approaches and proposes an alternative model of morality that acknowledges its context-bound, inter-subjective nature.

Appearing more critical than Walker (1998) of the utility of poststructuralist insights for feminism, Chancer (1998) attempts to bridge the divide between feminists stressing either individual sexual freedom or the sexist subordination of women. Consequently, sensitive to differences among women due, for example, to 'race', class and sexual orientation, as well as commonalities, she analyses a number of issues, including, pornography, beauty and appearance, prostitution and rape and develops an argument for a theoretical position that she labels '(radically) feminist and socialist'.

Just as Chancer (1998) does, di Leonardo (1998) endorses Marx's insights and criticises poststructuralism during her 'Red Tour' of anthropology in the United States. Here poststructuralism is criticised, specifically, for denying a real world outside language, along with a number of particular trends that include liberalism, cultural feminism, and postcolonial theory. Poststructuralist thought, specifically within feminist theory, is also highlighted in Daly's (1998) text as a recent negative influence. However, unlike Chancer (1998) and di Leonardo (1998), Daly (1998) does not seem to advocate any form of historical materialism. Instead, sitting somewhat awkwardly in the 1998 sample as a whole due to her sweeping account of the invasion of women's bodies and the earth by men in which differences among women seem to disappear, she endorses a cultural feminist influenced form of ecofeminism that swings between essentialism and idealism. Indeed, the type of women centeredness that Daly (1998) advocates is vehemently attacked within Jong's (1998) selection of reflective and, frequently, anecdotal essays that address issues such as the author's own experiences of being a writer, other writers' experiences, media representations of women and argue against campaigns to censor pornography.

Finally, drawing on data from existing historical work on women's lives, interviews and the author's personal experiences and appearing to exhibit liberal tendencies with a cultural feminist flavour, Roberts' (1998) text provides insights into a number of different roles that women carry out. After describing women performing a range of public and private sphere roles and calling women to respect diversity among women and the multiple nature of individual women's roles, Roberts (1998) stresses that ultimately it is the role of nurturer that provides a connectedness between women across time and space.

5.32: Hypothesis One: Dominant Theoretical Perspectives

As with the British 1998 sample and in contrast to the expected results for 1980, poststructuralist rather than historical materialist perspectives are predicted to be the most dominant perspectives in the 1998 USA sample. Therefore, I will now consider the texts in

each journal in turn followed by the books in relation to Hypothesis One. To aid my reflections and to begin to compare the 1980 and 1998 USA samples, the 1998 texts will be read against those in the 1980 sample. In addition, I will, at times, refer to the conclusions I drew from the 1998 British sample. While I will be led to draw different conclusions from the journal and book sample respectively, I will suggest that there is insufficient evidence to firmly confirm that poststructuralist perspectives are dominant overall.

When compared to the 1980 USA sample and in line with my arguments about the 1998 British sample, it is immediately evident that poststructuralist perspectives are informing far more of the texts in the 1998 USA sample. For example, I suggested that it was difficult to find real evidence of poststructuralism in the USA 1980 texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*. However, in the 1998 USA *Women's Studies International Forum* texts, I believe that Woolacott (1998), Kauanui (1998), Uchida (1998) and Jeneffsky and Miller (1998) demonstrate particular sensitivity to poststructuralist views during their respective examinations of the textual construction of multiple identities, the highly specific and fractured nature of postcolonial identities, the discursive construction of Asian-American women and 'lesbian' images that reinforce and stabilise heterosexuality. Yet, while some other texts may focus on ideas and highlight differences among women by addressing, for example, perceptions and attitudes (Dodd's, 1998) or women's understanding of their everyday experiences (Brayboy and Morgan, 1998), there seems to be more of a grounding of these ideas within women's experiences. In addition, while, for example, Gilmartin and Brunn (1998) and Raymond (1998) respectively focus on depictions of women in cartoons and definitions of violence against women, they do not appear to do so in a manner that stresses the multiplicity or fluidity that would be associated with poststructuralist approaches.

Sensitivity to class issues is evident in at least some of the texts in *Women's Studies International Forum*, which seems to demonstrate some evidence of a concern with insights that are associated with Marx (e.g. Soh, 1998; Dodds, 1998). Likewise, by

describing the oppression experienced by women with disabilities as being systematically produced by social structures as well as by oppressive stereotypes, historical materialist influences seem to be informing Ferri and Gregg's (1998) article. However, as I argued throughout my reflection on the British 1998 sample and will continue to highlight in the USA 1998 sample, a general rise in the number of texts demonstrating influence of the insights associated with Black or multiracial feminism is striking in this journal (e.g. Kauani, 1998; Soh, 1998; Brayboy and Morgan, 1998; Davis, 1998; Uchida, 1998).

During my reflections on the 1980 USA sample in Chapter Four, I suggested that *Feminist Studies* seemed to be the journal with the most socialist feminist 'flavour'. Admittedly, the 1980 concern about a need to develop theory that is influenced by historical materialism in some form seems to have somewhat declined in the 1998 texts. Nevertheless, while, for example, racialized discourses of citizenship form the focus for Williams and Peterson (1998), the authors draw attention to the historically situated social relations of race, class and gender that are seen to be shaping these discourses as well as being shaped by them. In addition, the cluster of essays written by the Women's Committee of 100 directly addressing welfare reforms (Boris, 1998; Kittay, 1998; Michel, 1998; Mink, 1998; Kombluh, 1998) and articles examining the effects of economic restructuring (Nelson & Smith, 1998) and the Global program on AIDS (Booth, 1998) seem to share the concern of a number of the 1980 texts to mix Marxism and feminism in a manner that pays attention to economics as well as gender. Yet, while the Women's Committee of 100 are directly addressing poor women and developing arguments and describing their action against welfare reform, there is an underlying tone that seems to hint at a concern with academic feminism's relative lack of active concern for poor women.

Certainly, compared to the 1980 texts in *Feminist Studies*, I believe that there is much more evidence of poststructuralist influences in the 1998 texts in *Feminist Studies*. Indeed, I suggested that poststructuralist insights were relatively negligible in 1980. In contrast, I would suggest, for example, that articles analysing recent discursive approaches to the body (Hausman, 1998; McLerran's, 1998) 1920s women's masculine

fashions (Doan, 1998), the multiple and fluid identity constructed in the narrative of a Papuan migrant woman (Polier, 1998) and the mis-representation of French feminism in the USA (Moses, 1998), despite their differences, all point towards a greater awareness of poststructuralism.

More generally, I believe that there is less evidence of the influence or concern about the influence of cultural feminism within the 1998 articles in *Feminist Studies* when they are compared to the 1980 texts. Even though a number of the articles in the special issue on the Women's Studies PhD debate the pros and cons of autonomous and joint programmes, the concerns do not seem to centre on mixing with men, which might hint at the specific type of women centredness associated with cultural feminism. Instead, the concerns focus more on the practicalities of training, future employment for students and the institutional positioning of Women's Studies. In addition, although not absent from the 1980 texts in *Feminist Studies* and while Guy-Sheftall (1998a) still regards 'race' as being treated as a 'special issue' rather than a central concern, there does appear to be greater evidence of the influence of perspectives associated with women of colour in the 1998 texts (e.g. Williams and Peterson, 1998; Boris, 1998; Kittay, 1998; Michel, 1998; Booth, 1998; Polier, 1998; Newton, 1998).

While certainly not absent from *Signs* in the 1980 sample, I did not believe that the evidence suggested historical materialist dominance. Nevertheless, poststructuralist influences seemed relatively rare in the journal as a whole in 1980. However, while some of the 1998 texts in *Signs* still seem to at least hint at a concern with historical materialism there appears to be much greater sensitivity to poststructuralist insights than there was in the 1980 USA texts published there.

A concern with political economy or gendered social relations is detectable within some of the texts. For example, O'Neil (1998) links women's oppression to class inequalities as well as to 'race' and gender, Rosser (1998) highlights the need for multiple feminist perspectives, including socialist ones, in women and science and engineering projects

and Kou (1998) and James (1998) respectively highlight the influence of social, economic and political contexts on policy making and female circumcision. In addition, while focussing on the construction of identity in media images, Bing-Canar and Zerkel (1998) frame their discussion within broader social and ideological contexts.

Many of the remaining texts do locate their analyses in time and space. However, I believe that the shifting, internal workings of local discourses that are associated with poststructuralism are much more of a central concern in a number of these texts. For example, this concern appears to be detectable in Esquibel's (1998) examination of the textual construction of lesbian desire, Wald's (1998) examination of female rock bands, Carter's (1998) exploration of the work of a young video artist, Porter's (1998) analysis of schoolgirls' symbolic resistances in Kenya, Shih's (1998) analysis of media depictions of Mainland Chinese women, Projansky's (1998) consideration of media discourses of girlhood and Fehrenbach (1998) and Poiger's (1998) exploration of German masculinity. In addition, Foster's (1998) seemingly linguistic understanding of social and historical contexts in her exploration of the construction of the body through its interaction with linguistic codes and conventions reveals poststructuralist influence.

Yet, poststructuralist influences seem relatively absent in Landsman's (1998) situated, interpretative study of the social construction of motherhood, Fox's (1998) evaluation of the perspectives informing solutions advocated for and the institutional and social contexts of graduate science and engineering projects and Fleischman's (1998) criticism of sexism in academic writing conventions, which draws on her personal experiences.

On a more general note, when compared to the 1980 texts, I believe that more of the 1998 texts in this journal, despite differences in their particular approaches, display evidence of sensitivity to the insights of Black or multiracial feminism (e.g. Porter, 1998; Bing-Canar & Zerkel, 1998; O'Neil, 1998; Shih, 1998; Hegland, 1998; Joseph, 1998; Mayer, 1998; James, 1998; Oyewumi, 1998; Rosser, 1998).

In line with my arguments about the 1998 USA journal sample and the 1998 British sample as a whole, there is much more evidence of a concern with 'race' and ethnicity in the 1998 USA books than there is in the 1980 books. Consequently, this demonstrates a rise in the influence of the insights associated with perspectives such as Black and multiracial feminism. Thus, while not suggesting that the philosophical underpinnings of the texts are homogeneous, these influences seem to be central to texts by Myers (1998), Nelson (1998), Abu-Lughod (1998), Feldhaus (1998), Hahner (1998), Rogers (1998), Ling (1998), Diggs (1998), Staudt (1998) and Herschatter et al. (1998). They also inform the difference sensitive approaches of Coryell et al. (1998), Walker (1998), Chancer (1998) and di Leonardo (1998).

With more specific regard for Hypothesis One, compared to the 1980 USA sample and as I detected in the British 1998 sample, there is much greater evidence of books that are particularly heavily influenced by poststructuralism in the 1998 USA sample. Such texts include those by Abu-Lughod (1998), Rogers (1998) and Leiberman (1998). While attempting to integrate other perspectives into their approaches, including historical materialist approaches in Marxist and non-Marxist forms, poststructuralist influences also appear to be fairly dominant in texts by Nelson (1998) and Walker (1998). In addition, Hahner's (1998) text appears to be at least partly intended to encourage historians to make greater use of poststructuralist perspectives.

Although, perhaps, lacking much evidence of historical materialist approaches, individual chapters in Longmire and Merrill's (1998) text exhibit a number of different theoretical tendencies including poststructuralism. Multiple perspectives, including historical materialism as well as poststructuralism, are also evident in Feldhaus (1998) and Fay's (1998) texts. Likewise, although featuring Foucauldian discourse analysis within the context of policy analysis, Staudt (1998) outlines the benefits of using multiple feminist perspectives, including historical materialist approaches, in her text.

In addition to the books in which poststructuralism, either on its own or mixed with other approaches, seems to be a positive influence, there are a number texts in which poststructuralist insights are either explicitly criticised or not particularly evident. Daly (1998), whose blending of cultural feminism and ecofeminism certainly does not seem to promote historical materialism, mentions poststructuralism in order to criticise it. Yet, for Chancer (1998) and di Leonardo (1998), again, appearing critical of poststructuralist insights, historical materialism appears to be much more central as the positive guiding influence. Likewise, Ling's (1998) socially, politically and economically contextualised account of Chinese immigrant women has a historical materialist flavour. In addition, while their particular approaches are not uniform, poststructuralist influences seem to be relatively absent from texts, by Myers (1998), stressing racism in the structures of society, Rothblum et al. (1998), in part, considering the impact of the geographical and social environment, Diggs (1998), reflecting on Japanese and USA women's experiences and Roberts (1998), describing the roles of women in society.

Do my reflections on the 1998 USA texts in relation to Hypothesis One suggest that there is enough evidence to confirm the dominance of poststructuralist perspectives? In *Women's Studies International Forum*, it is clear that there has been a rise in poststructuralist influence when the 1998 texts are compared to the 1980 USA sample. However, because poststructuralism does not appear to be a heavy influence in number of the 1998 texts, I do not believe that there is firm evidence to suggest that the hypothesis is confirmed in this journal. In *Feminist Studies*, I suggested that historical materialism in some form seemed to be the most dominant perspective informing the 1980 texts. Certainly, the 1998 texts include a number that seem to be influenced by historical materialism. However, it is clearly evident that poststructuralism is influencing a greater number of the 1998 texts than the 1980 texts. However, my decision about whether there is enough evidence to suggest that poststructuralist perspectives are most dominant within this journal is clouded somewhat by the number of texts in the special issue debating issues related to the Women's Studies PhD. Here, whether discussing the concept of interdisciplinarity or discussing the pros and cons of autonomous or joint

doctoral programmes, the authors do not seem to be analysing their own situations and thoughts along poststructuralist lines. Yet, even if these articles are suspended from the sample on the dubious grounds that their authors are debating the context of their work rather than providing examples of the type of work they produce, I still do not believe that there is sufficient evidence to confirm Hypothesis One.

In *Signs*, there is much greater evidence of poststructuralism in the 1998 texts when they are compared to the 1980 texts. Nevertheless, the existence of a number of texts in which poststructuralism appears to be reasonably absent leads me to reserve judgement about whether poststructuralism is dominant. However, in terms of the books, again, there seems to be an enormous increase in the proportion of texts in which poststructuralist insights are present, either as a dominant positive influence, partial positive influence or negative influence when they are compared to the 1980 USA texts. Given this increase and the differences between texts that mix poststructuralist insights with others or criticise or appear to neglect poststructuralism, I suggest that the book sample seems to confirm Hypothesis One.

The conclusions I have drawn from the 1998 USA sample as a whole are similar to those that I reached when reflecting on the British sample in relation to Hypothesis One. Certainly, there has been a significant rise in the number of texts that appear to be influenced by poststructuralist perspectives. However, while taking account of texts that are heavily informed by poststructuralism and those that mix it with other approaches or criticise it led me to suggest that poststructuralism appears to be dominant in the book sample, I did not believe that there was sufficient evidence for the hypothesis to be firmly confirmed in the journal sample. Therefore, just as I suggested when reflecting on the British 1998 sample, it is prudent to reserve judgement about whether or the extent to which poststructuralist perspectives are dominant in the 1998 USA sample as a whole.

More generally, in comparison to the 1980 USA sample, I believe that there has been a decrease in texts that are influenced by the type of feminism that I described as cultural

feminism in Chapter Three. In addition, just as I suggested about the British sample, despite differences in their particular philosophical underpinnings, there has been a significant rise in the number of texts influenced by the types of feminism that are associated with Black feminism or women of colour.

5.33: Hypothesis Two: Dominant Concerns in the Content of the Texts

Just as with the 1998 British sample, according to the second hypothesis, the content of the 1998 USA texts is expected to be more oriented towards addressing cultural issues such as those pertaining to language, representation, symbolisation and discourse rather than concrete material social and economic issues. In addition, texts are expected to be seeking ways to understand and analyse the oppression of individual women and their personal responses to it rather than describing and analysing women's oppression as a collective issue that requires collective responses to end it. While differences between the 1980 and 1998 USA texts will become apparent during the course of my reflections, in line with the conclusions I drew from the British 1998 texts, I will be led to suggest that both parts of Hypothesis Two remain unconfirmed in the 1998 USA sample.

When describing the 1998 USA texts in *Women's Studies International Forum*, I suggested that a concern with representation in some form appears to link a number of the texts. In addition, I pointed out that this concern is one that is also evident in a number of the 1980 texts in this journal. In the 1998 sample, texts exhibiting a concern with what might be regarded as cultural issues include those that explore British women's written reports (Woolacott, 1998), the fractured nature of Hawaiian national identity (Kauani, 1998), the perceptions and attitudes of East German women (Dodds, 1998), Native American women's understanding of their experiences (Brayboy & Morgan, 1998), discourses of Orientalization (Uchida, 1998), 'lesbian' images in *Penthouse* magazine (Jenfsky & Miller 1998), political cartoons (Gilmartin & Brunn, 1998), government legislation (Kampwirth, 1998), oppressive stereotypes (Ferri & Gregg, 1998) and

definitions of violence against women (Raymond, 1998). Nevertheless, with a couple of exceptions (e.g. Raymond, 1998; Gilmartin & Brunn, 1998), compared to the 1980 USA texts in this journal, the general understanding of representation seems to be much more fluid, highlighting the instability of representation within time and space as well as across it to a much greater extent. As such, this understanding is similar to that which was evident in a number of the 1998 British texts in this journal.

However, although, perhaps, not uniformly the central concerns of the texts in the journal as a whole, material issues are addressed. For example, these issues include work (e.g. Ferri & Gregg, 1998; Dodds, 1998), prostitution as violence against women, (e.g. Raymond, 1998) women's everyday experiences (e.g. Brayboy & Morgan, 1998), poverty and violence as causes of depression (e.g. Davis, 1998) and social and economic inequalities more generally (e.g. Soh, 1998). Therefore, as with the British 1998 texts from this journal and unlike my conclusions about the 1980 USA texts, given the mixing of concerns in some of the 1998 texts, I am hesitant about suggesting that cultural issues on their own actually dominate.

Turning towards the second aspect of Hypothesis Two, I suggested that the 1980 USA texts in this journal were quite firmly collectivist in orientation. In contrast to the USA 1980 texts from this journal but in line with the 1998 British texts, I believe that the tendency to address women as a relatively homogenous group or portray them as being relatively docile transmitters of systems that are imposed upon them seems to have declined in the 1998 USA texts. Certainly, some texts, such as Brayboy and Morgan's (1998), do seek to address commonalities as well as differences among women. Yet, despite the diversity in their particular foci and theoretical approaches, I believe that it is a general sense of sensitivity to differences among women that arises out of a number of the 1998 USA texts (e.g. Ferri & Gregg, 1998; Woolacott, 1998; Dodds, 1998; Kauanui, 1998; Soh, 1998; Davis, 1998; Uchida, 1998).

In addition, compared to the 1980 USA texts and as I found in the 1998 British texts from this journal, I believe that a concern with individual women's agency is much more apparent in a greater number of the 1998 USA texts (e.g. Woolcott, 1998; Kauanui, 1998; Davis, 1998; Uchida, 1998). Nevertheless, on the whole, there still appears to be an emphasis on trying to understand women's experiences and their resistance to oppression within contexts that are not of their own making. Admittedly, Dodds (1998), for example, cautions against the possibility of attempting to generalise about women. Yet, as I suggested when discussing the British texts in this journal, I believe that the problem for many of the 1998 USA texts seems to be trying to articulate a collectivist outlook that neither ignores differences among women nor women's individual agency.

Again, I believe that the 1998 texts in *Feminist Studies* demonstrate evidence of a mixture of concerns that are both material and cultural. Certainly, in some texts cultural concerns do seem to be quite dominant. For example, these texts include McLerran's (1998) analysis of the discursive shaping of the body, Hausmans' (1998) consideration of the persistent problems in theorising the materiality of sex and Doan's (1998) examination of female masculine fashions in the 1920s. In addition, intellectual concerns, which might be regarded as cultural, are central to Moses' (1998) text, the cluster of texts examining the development of Women's Studies PhD programmes and Newton's (1998) exploration of recent work by men on masculinity. Nevertheless, whether by addressing these issues within their social and political as well as intellectual contexts, calling for studies to be more local and historically specific or considering the practical as well as intellectual factors surrounding the development of Women's Studies PhD programmes, a concern with material issues does not appear to be absent from these particular texts. Moreover, it is social and economic issues that underpin further texts such as those by members of the Women's Committee of 100, addressing welfare reform, and Nelson and Smith (1998), examining the effects of economic restructuring.

Although I noted an increase in a concern with differences among women in the 1998 texts from *Feminist Studies*, on the whole, I believe that the collectivist outlook that I

detected in the 1980 texts is still apparent in the 1998 texts. Admittedly, this outlook might not be easily detectable in some texts, for example, Polier's (1998) analysis of the unique, multiple identity of a Papuan migrant woman and McLerran's (1998) consideration of the shaping of the body by multiple discourses. However, because of the specific foci of a number of the texts there is a strong feeling of collectivism. This feeling is evident in the cluster of texts calling for activism against recent welfare reforms, Guy-Sheftall (1998a) and Booth's (1998) call for global perspectives and globalist strategies and McDermott's (1998) stressing of the collective activity of learning about women's experiences and feminism in the classroom. Nevertheless, it seems to be apparent that the desire for a collectivist outlook does not seem to be without tensions. These tensions are explicitly articulated by Mink (1998) who highlights the oppression of women by women and reflects on concerns about speaking for or acting on behalf of women whose circumstances are different from one's own.

Perhaps more so than in *Feminist Studies*, cultural issues seem to be the central concern of a number of the 1998 texts in *Signs*. Cultural issues seem to form the dominant collective concern for the majority of texts in the special issue. Here, for example, texts examine the construction of lesbian desire in Chicana fiction (Esquibel, 1998), schoolgirls' symbolic acts of resistance (Porter, 1998), a young woman making videos as a critical response to US culture (Carter, 1998), female rock bands and discourses of girlhood (Wald, 1998) and media discourses of girlhood (Projansky, 1998). In addition, cultural issues continue to form the central focus of a number of other texts in the journal. The foci of these include media depictions of Mainland Chinese women (Shih's, 1998), the cultural redefinition of German masculinity after World War Two (Fehrenbach, 1998; Poiger, 1998), the linguistic shaping of the body (Foster, 1998; Oyewumi, 1998) and the multiple nature of Islam (Hegland, 1998).

Nevertheless, a number of other texts demonstrate quite a more even mixing of both material and cultural concerns within their particular analyses. Thus, again, this observation raises doubt about whether a concern with cultural issues is dominant rather

than a mixing of cultural and material issues. For example, texts focusing on a young women's only organisation (O'Neil, 1998), female circumcision (James, 1998), social policy (Kou, 1998) and Muslim women's struggles for women's rights (Joseph's, 1998) all exhibit a mixture of social and economic as well as ideological concerns. In addition, concern about the underrepresentation of women in science and engineering - a material issue - underpins Rosser (1998) and Fox's (1998) texts. Fleischman (1998) uses her personal career trajectory when criticising writing conventions, Landsman (1998) analyses women's interpretations of their experiences within concrete social contexts as well as their responses to dominant attitudes and, finally, Myer (1998) situates her examination of Muslim women's mourning rituals within their social and religious contexts.

In terms of the second part of Hypothesis Two, I suggested that evidence of an individualist outlook was relatively absent from the 1980 *Signs* texts. As I noted when describing the 1998 *Signs* texts, both a concern with differences and women's agency appeared to be more central to the 1998 texts when they are compared to the 1980 texts. Certainly, I believe that a distinctively individualistic outlook is evident in Carter's (1998) exploration of one girl working out the contradictions within her own identity by making videos in her bedroom. However, I do not believe that the overall outlook of the journal is individualist. For example, in a number of texts (e.g. Bing-Canar & Zerkel, 1998; Porter, 1998; Rosenberg & Garofalo, 1998; O'Neil, 1998; Oyewumi, 1998), although the groups may be specific, women's agency, in the form of resistance, is depicted as a collective act. In addition, while differences among women are clearly visible and debated in the texts, it is particular groups of women rather than individuals without connections to others that are under the spotlight (e.g. Hegland, 1998; Mayer, 1998; Shih, 1998; Landsman, 1998). However, the question that appears to be causing much more of a general concern than in 1980 is the one that Kaufman's (1998) article emphasises, namely, how can women develop a strong sense of commonality without erasing differences?

In line with Hypothesis Two, a dominant concern with cultural issues does appear to be evident in a number of the books. For example, cultural issues appear to be the most

central ones in books addressing discourses about Middle Eastern women (Abu-Lughod, 1998), the historical congealing of the ideology of national manhood within texts (Nelson, 1998), representations of femininity in Maharashtra (Feldhaus, 1998), representations of women in travel accounts (Hahner, 1998), discursive resistances of women in novels (Rogers, 1998), textual representations of the mother figure (Lieberman, 1998), approaches to literary criticism (Fay, 1998) and gendered communication patterns and sexism in language, novels and the media (Longmire & Merrill, 1998).

Nevertheless, many other texts seem to contain a more even mixture of concerns that appear to be both material and cultural. Therefore, as with the British 1998 sample, I am reluctant to suggest that there is firm evidence to confirm that cultural issues alone rather than a mixing of concerns are actually more dominant. For example, Staudt's (1998) analysis of policies and institutions within broader political and economic contexts includes a mixture of concerns that can be viewed as both cultural and material. This mixture continues to be evident in politically, socially and economically contextualised examinations of Anthropology in the USA (di Leonardo, 1998), Women's Studies in China (Herschatter et al., 1998) and Chinese women immigrants (Ling, 1998). In addition, along with developing theory in which social relations are central, Chancer's (1998) text contains analyses of material as well as cultural substantive feminist issues. Likewise, Daly's (1998) text examines the material and ideological domination of women by men. While one's own sense of self-esteem might not be regarded as a material issue in itself, Myers (1998) measures it against material issues, such as employment and social relations within the family. It is the meshing of moral and social life that forms the basis for Walker's (1998) model of morality. As a final example, Rothblum et al.'s (1998) text explores material as well as psychological issues by considering the affect of women's concrete experiences in the Antarctic on their social and interpersonal relationships.

I suggested that the 1980 USA book sample appeared to contain slightly more evidence of sensitivity to differences among women than the did British 1980 sample. However, when compared to the 1980 USA sample, I believe that the awareness of differences

among women seems to be much stronger and consistently acknowledged throughout the 1998 USA book sample. Certainly there are exceptions to this greater awareness but I believe these to be very few. For example, Daly (1998) seems to erase differences among women by urging women to recognise their 'inherent connections' to each other and Roberts (1998) stresses women's connectedness to each other as nurturers, although she does also call for sensitivity to differences among women. Yet, as I have repeatedly noted when addressing the second aspect of Hypothesis Two, I do not believe that recognition of difference on its own represents an individualist outlook. Certainly, Rogers (1998) and some of the authors in Coryell et al. (1998) text do stress acts of resistance by individual women. Nevertheless, on the whole, I believe a problem that is again highlighted in the book sample is how to create a collectivist outlook that neither denies individual agency nor ignores differences, including hierarchical ones, among women.

To sum up my arguments about the 1998 USA sample in relation to the first part of Hypothesis Two I will draw together my conclusions from each part of the sample. In the 1998 USA sample from *Women's Studies International Forum*, I decided that there was insufficient evidence to confirm the first part of Hypothesis Two because of the number of texts in which a mixing of concerns was evident. My decision here contrasts with the conclusion I reached about the 1980 USA texts in *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, where, contrary to what was expected, I suggested that cultural issues were most dominant. While cultural issues did appear to be more dominant in some of the 1998 USA texts in *Feminist Studies*, I decided that there was insufficient evidence to confirm the hypothesis. Again, this decision was due to the number of texts in which a mixing of material and cultural concerns was evident. While I suggested that material issues seemed to be dominant as primary concerns in *Feminist Studies* in 1980, this mixing of concerns was present in a number of the 1980 texts. Again, the 1998 texts in *Signs* and the book sample did contain a number of texts in which cultural issues appeared to be dominant. Yet, this time in line with the 1980 *Signs* and book samples, due to the mixing of concerns that was again visible in many of the texts, I decided that the evidence was insufficient to confirm the hypothesis. As was the case with the 1998 British sample,

although it is clear that cultural issues do seem to be dominant in a number of the 1998 USA texts, there does not appear to be firm evidence to confirm that cultural issues are the more dominant concern of the 1998 USA sample as a whole.

The conclusions I have drawn from the second part of Hypothesis Two when reflecting on the 1998 USA sample are similar to those that I drew when addressing the British sample. Unlike the 1980 USA sample, where the collectivist outlook identified in the sample as a whole confirmed what was expected, I have suggested that, with a few possible exceptions, the expected result, namely an individualist outlook, remained unconfirmed. As with the British 1998 sample, I believe that a much higher proportion of the texts in the 1998 USA sample are concerned with differences among women and also stress the agency of individual women when they are compared to the 1980 sample. Nevertheless, on the whole, as I suggested with the British 1998 sample, I do not believe that these findings automatically represent an individualist outlook. Instead, I believe that they highlight the problem of trying to understand how a collectivist outlook can be sustained in a manner that denies neither hierarchical differences among women nor the agency that individual women exercise in their everyday lives.

5.4: Summary of 1980 and 1998 Immanent Analysis -

Hypotheses One, Two and Three⁴

Before moving on to see whether the broader social, political and economic contexts of their production can help to enhance understanding of the sample texts, it seems prudent to make some general comments about my findings and, importantly, in so doing, reflect on my findings in relation to Hypothesis Three. This third hypothesis states that the content of the texts is related to the *Weltanschauungen* informing them. During my reflections I have only firmly confirmed one side of one part of Hypothesis Two, namely, I suggested that the dominant outlook of the 1980 texts was collectivist, as predicted. I

believe that at least part of my problem when assessing the texts in relation to the hypotheses was that the reality of the texts and their diversity within the years has just proved to be messier than I would have liked.

Nevertheless, in terms of the first hypothesis, although I have resisted drawing firm conclusions about dominance, certainly there are tendencies that are in line with what was predicted. On both sides of the Atlantic I suggested that there was clear evidence of historical materialist perspectives in a large number of the 1980 texts and that, in comparison, poststructuralist influence, although not absent, was relatively negligible. Indeed, in terms of the British texts, my reservations about drawing firm conclusions may, admittedly, have more to do with not being brave enough to nail my colours to the mast than lack of evidence in the sample. However, because of the number of texts in which it seemed difficult to locate any external base, I still believe that my reservations are warranted.

As expected in the first hypothesis, in the 1998 texts, it was clear that there had been an enormous increase in the number of texts where poststructuralist influences were visible. Nevertheless, I did not believe that this increase provided firm confirmation of Hypothesis One. It was also clear that on both sides of the Atlantic historical materialist insights were still highly visible in a number of the 1998 texts. Of course, particularly, in terms of the 1998 sample, it could be that the year I have chosen is simply too late. By 1998 it could well be the case that,

...some feminists [were] retreating from the extreme anti-materialist implications of postmodernism, and [were] edging back towards accepting the existence of structural inequalities.

(Jackson, 1998: 25)

However, whether this is the case and that if I had, for example, chosen 1993 for my second year different conclusions would have been reached remains a question that is outside the boundaries of this particular study.

⁴ The key findings for Hypotheses One and Two are summarised in Appendix IX.

As for the first part of Hypothesis Two, I believe that my dilemma here was that the closer I looked at the texts the more difficult it became to decide whether the concerns were actually material or cultural. As I argued during my reflections on the 1980 sample, in as much as a number of texts were either debating and trying to develop feminist theory or attacking male-bias in knowledge, they were concerned with cultural issues regardless of whether, as in many cases, the feminist theory or male-bias in knowledge was itself about material things. Moreover, as I pointed out in Chapter Three, ideology critique is an important part of the work carried out by feminists who are influenced by historical materialism. Therefore, it is, perhaps, hardly surprising that a number of the texts that I suggested were influenced by historical materialism actually appeared to be concerned with a mixture of material and cultural issues.

I did not suggest that there was poststructuralist dominance in the 1998 texts. The texts exhibiting poststructuralist influences in the 1998 sample included those that either mixed it with other approaches, or criticised it. Therefore, it is, perhaps, again, unsurprising that the dominant focus appeared to be on a mixing of cultural and material issues. In this light, my findings from the first part of Hypothesis Two do appear to be related to Hypothesis One, therefore, confirming Hypothesis Three.

Finally, I will consider the second part of Hypothesis Two. This part of the hypothesis was confirmed in the British and USA 1980 texts; I argued that the dominant outlook in both samples was collectivist. I suggested that the *Weltanschauungen* articulated in the 1980 texts on the whole seemed to entail large, relatively internally undifferentiated systems that were assumed to have relatively homogeneous, negative effects on women. Generally speaking, these systems tended to appear in the form of male values, the domestic mode of production or some form of mixing of capitalism and patriarchy. Therefore, it would seem to follow that even if class differences were acknowledged, women's collective oppression by patriarchy would produce a sense of being in the same boat as far as sexism was concerned and, thus, produce, the collectivist outlook, as predicted by Hypothesis Three.

I admit that I may appear to have partially refined the second part of Hypothesis Two during the course of my reflections on the 1998 texts. Yet, just as I suggested with the first part of this hypothesis, the simple either/or approach constructed by the second part of the hypothesis simply seemed difficult to operationalise. I defined the individualist outlook in terms of attempting to understand the different forms of oppression that are experienced by particular women and their individual responses to it. Thus, according to this definition, my decision to suggest that the texts tending to address differences between groups of women and action carried out by particular groups of women would seem defensible on the grounds that they are still talking in collective terms, even if the groups are smaller than that which encompasses all of womankind. In addition, in a number of texts differences among women are addressed on various levels in an attempt to appreciate individuality while at the same time building connections with other women. Again, this observation seems to justify my decision not to suggest that the outlook is individualist.

However, while pointing out reservations about some of the texts, I have also tended to shy away from suggesting that an individualist outlook is present even in many of the texts focussing attention on individual women's agency. I admit that this decision could be viewed as part of my own desire not to find an individualistic outlook within academic feminism. Nevertheless, rather than suggesting that this particular focus represents either an individualist or collectivist outlook, I have tended to conclude that it represents a tension between the two. I have generally tended to base this decision on the grounds that, although these particular women are exercising agency on their own, they are described as exercising it within contexts that are not of their own making. Therefore, the problem or the issue against which women's agency is exercised is presented as a social problem in many of these particular texts.

In terms of Hypothesis Three, I believe that my findings from the 1998 texts in relation to the second part of Hypothesis Two do map back onto the *Weltanschauungen* that I detected when addressing Hypothesis One. When the 1998 texts that appear to hint at

being influenced by historical materialism in some form are compared to those that are influenced by historical materialism in the 1980 sample, I believe that at least three things are visible. First, the structures have multiplied, hence, the stress on differences among women. Second, rather than making large generalisations, historical materialism appears to have become more historical. Third, by trying to come to terms with agency, I believe that those influenced by this perspective appear to be trying to make it more dialectical. In addition, large, relatively static systems seemed evident in the 1980 texts placing their primary emphasis on the negative effects of male values or norms. In contrast, the systems have multiplied and become more local and fluid in the 1998 texts keeping their analyses more firmly situated at the level of discourse.

I will end with some general observations. I believe that the general feeling arising out of the 1980 and 1998 texts respectively is very different. Despite differences between and within the geographical regions, some of the things that seemed to generally stand out when I read the 1980 texts were: a struggle to try to develop a theory of women's oppression, the uncovering and attacking of male-bias and, particularly in the 1980 USA journals the tracking of the in-roads that feminist knowledge was making within academe. As my descriptions and reflections of the 1980 texts demonstrated, disagreements certainly existed between feminists and, as was evident, for example, among the some of the texts in *Feminist Review* and the British 1980 book sample, questions relating to the problem of political unity were not absent. Nevertheless, when compared to the 1998 sample, I believe that the 1980 British and USA texts, on the whole, portray academic feminists as being on a relatively clear and urgent mission in terms of their political aim, but struggling amongst themselves to find the intellectual tools to aid them. However, the feelings arising when I read the 1998 texts were very different. Overall, when compared to the 1980 sample, the sense of urgency and certainty about women's oppression seemed to have become much more clouded. This feeling might be related to the increased awareness of the complexity of a world in which the acknowledgement of multiple hierarchical differences among women makes it difficult to build connections between

them. In addition, it might be linked to the concern expressed by Mink (1998:55-6) about the problems related to speaking or prescribing solutions for other women.

Chapter Six: Stage Three - Sociological Analysis:

Academic Feminism in Britain and the USA 1980 and 1998

When the structures and tendencies of...styles of thought have been worked out, we are faced with the task of their sociological imputation.

(Mannheim, 1968: 277)

6.1 Introduction

As I mentioned in Chapter One, it is only after conducting the second stage of immanent analysis that Mannheim suggests, "[t]he sociological task proper...begins" (1952a:189). Indeed, it is here, during Mannheim's third stage of analysis, where knowledge, already examined during immanent analysis, is considered in relation to other social factors. Therefore, while I injected a temporal element into my exploration of academic feminism in Chapters Four and Five to consider what types of knowledge were being published during particular years, in this chapter I am intending to add a spatial element. The purpose of doing so is to attempt to gain a greater understanding of the results from the second stage. In this light, it is this third stage that links to Hypothesis Four and also forms the focus for this chapter. The fourth and final hypothesis states that intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

Now, in terms of the broad trends that I identified in the last two chapters, contrary to what was predicted by Hypothesis One, I argued that it was not simply the case that historical materialist perspectives had given way to poststructuralist perspectives in terms of dominance. In addition, I did not suggest that there was sufficient evidence to provide firm confirmation of historical materialist dominance in the 1980 sample, although, admittedly, I did note that I might have been overly cautious about the decision I had reached about the British 1980 sample. Nevertheless, in light of my findings and given the space constraints within this project, it seems prudent not to focus my attention on searching for an understanding of the emergence and rise of poststructuralist perspectives during the third

stage of this project. Instead, marking a starting point rather than an end point, it seems more relevant to attempt to begin to understand the more general shifts that were evident within the majority of the perspectives in circulation in the 1998 texts regardless of whether they were poststructuralist perspectives or not. These shifts were the greater attention to diversity and women's agency that was generally evident throughout the 1998 sample. Thus, the questions I wish to consider in this chapter are twofold. First, "Why, when compared to the 1980 texts, did the internal characteristics of the majority of the perspectives in the 1998 texts appear to have altered from the types that I labelled broadly, although not exclusively, socialist and radical feminism in order to take more account of diversity among women and within the identities of individual women?" Secondly, "Why had there been a shift towards taking more account of women's agency?" It is important to emphasise that I am not claiming that the shifts I have identified towards diversity and agency are surprising (e.g. de Groot & Maynard, 1993; Roseneil, 1995).

Thus, the investigation that I will carry out within this chapter, namely, "Can an understanding of the broader contexts in which the texts were produced enhance understanding of the general shifts towards greater attention to diversity and agency?" represents only one of the phases that Mannheim appears to suggest is necessary during the third stage. Investigating the more specific questions, of, for example, which feminists in the 1980 sample were more likely to endorse the perspectives I have labelled radical perspectives and in which ways or which were more likely to endorse poststructuralist perspectives in the 1998 sample and in which ways, would represent the second phase of the third stage. As I mentioned in Chapter Two, to attempt to answer these more specific questions greater analysis and comparison of individual authors' and editors' backgrounds are required than time and space will allow for within this project. However, by conducting the first phase here the ground will be prepared for the second phase of analysis in future research.

To achieve my ends this chapter will be split into five main sections. I mentioned in Chapters One and Three that Mannheim does not believe it is the task of the sociology of

knowledge to search for the ultimate origins of specific forms of knowledge. In line with Mannheim, I certainly do not intend to search for the ultimate origins of contemporary academic feminism in this chapter, which, as I noted in Chapter Three, could probably be traced back as far as the Enlightenment period and even beyond. Yet in order to attempt to situate the texts within the context of the late 20th Century, it seems prudent to begin by questioning not simply why academic feminism was speaking in terms of the broad trends I am attempting to understand in this chapter. Instead, as I hope will become clear during the course of my descriptions, it seems important to attempt to gain some insights into the prior question that the trends themselves seem to beg, namely, "Why was academic feminism speaking in any terms at the end of the 20th Century?" To this end, taking the upheaval of the Second World War as marking a watershed in history, although by no means implying a complete break with the past, in the first section I will seek to examine the type of conditions that might provide an understanding of the emergence of Second Wave feminism in the late 1960s and 1970s. In the next two sections I will track some of the developments within the Women's Liberation Movement during the late 1960s and 1970s - the period before the 'gap' that some authors consider has arisen between grass-roots feminism and academic feminism emerged (Tax, 1998:319; Bird, 2002:145; Stacey, 1993:72). These three sections will primarily draw on existing historical studies of the period and will take the form of a relatively straightforward narrative. The first three sections will be followed by a brief section where I will pause in order to draw attention back to the main trends in the 1980 texts. Because the guiding thread that has taken my account up to the 1980s, namely, the emergence of and developments within what might be regarded as a visible social movement, appears to have become increasingly frayed in both countries by the mid-1980s, the last section does not take the form of a relatively straightforward narrative. Instead, in the last section, I will consider a series of specific political, economic, social and academic factors that, when taken collectively, appear to be among those most relevant for enhancing understanding of the broad shifts towards greater attention to diversity and agency that were evident in the 1998 sample.

I am acutely aware that unlike my approach in the last two chapters, where I made a distinct attempt to avert charges of 'homing in' on specific texts that appeared to confirm my hypotheses, the broader approach I will take in my descriptions and analysis below will, inevitably, leave me much more open to charges about the selective nature of my research. Indeed, I realise that my attempt to sketch out a general picture here could result in no more than a description of a 'straw' grass-roots movement and broader context that at best only picks out a few of the seemingly 'relevant' facts and at worst ends up as a mythical caricature. As Rowbotham points out when reflecting specifically on the prospect of writing a history about the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement in Britain,

[a] history of the emergence of women's liberation would need to take account of those large changes in capitalist society, population, sexuality, work, welfare, consumption, education, the media and the rest. It would need to trace the impact of past feminist movements. It would examine cultural attitudes. Ah, how many fashion magazines, coroners' reports, biographies, letters, embroidered handkerchiefs can be studied in a lifetime?

(1983:2-3)

I am not suggesting that I will present a complete history of Second Wave feminism in Britain and the USA or the more general political, economic and social contexts below. As Rowbotham goes on to say, "[a] history, like a culture, is not the word made finite but the culling and coaxing of available material" (1983:4). As I mentioned in Chapter Two, the procedure that is guiding me through this third stage of analysis is called inference to the best explanation. That is to say, while other explanations may exist, those that I describe and reflect on during this chapter, based, primarily, on my reading of and reflection on existing accounts, appear to be those that are among the most likely (Williams, 2000:41-42). Hopefully, the culling and coaxing that I perform throughout this chapter will be regarded in this light.

6.2: Post World War Two Contexts -

Liberal Feminism in the USA and Radical Politics in Britain and the USA

By 1980, the first year chosen for the sample texts, it was just over ten years since visible organised activism in the form of Second Wave feminism had begun to emerge on both sides of the Atlantic. I use the word 'organised' loosely because, as DuPlessis and Snitow point out, "[f]rom the start, the feminist movement was polyphonic. There was no central group, no central leader, no single political analysis, and no single moment of access" (1998a:11). DuPlessis and Snitow (1998a) are, admittedly, speaking specifically about Second Wave feminism in the USA. Yet the spontaneity of the beginnings of Second Wave feminism in Britain as various groups of women began to form at the end of the sixties and its continued pluralism in the first decade of activism is highlighted in accounts of the situation (Coote & Campbell, 1982; Bouchier, 1983).

To pinpoint the exact 'birth' of Second Wave feminism in either country appears rather difficult. Nevertheless, it would seem that it was not caused by a simple inexplicable and sudden form of enlightenment that led to an explosion of women's groups, which organised to protest women's unequal position in relation to men. Instead, it would appear that a combination of economic, political and social changes after the upheaval of the Second World War meant that by the late 1960s the time was propitious for the re-birth of visible feminism in its Second Wave form. Thus, in order to attempt to begin to understand why academic feminism took the forms that it did in 1980 and 1998, I will begin my exploration by addressing the post-war contexts out of which Second Wave feminism emerged. To this end, I will start with a brief description of the context in which liberal feminism re-emerged in the United States. Following this, I will turn to focus more sustained attention on exploring the background to and emergence of the 'radical' politics of the 1960s, which are generally regarded as providing the impetus for the emergence of Second Wave feminism in the more militant form of the Women's Liberation Movement.

Following an initial economic upheaval after the Second World War, Britain and the USA witnessed an economic boom during the 1950s. Accompanying this boom was a rise in consumer culture, in which, "women were designated a key role, as shoppers-in-chief" (Coote & Campbell, 1982), and an increase in predominantly low-level gender specific jobs for women, notably, without any significant improvement in public child-care facilities. In addition, technological developments leading to gradual, although far from perfect, improvements in birth control, meant that by the early 1960s women were potentially able, "to choose with some certainty when to have children" (Coote & Campbell, 1982:12). Nevertheless, sitting somewhat uneasily alongside the pressures to increase the workforce during the period of economic boom and (heterosexual) women's potential freedom to experiment sexually, was a post-war re-strengthening of the ideology of domesticity. This ideology acted to reinforce the sanctity of married life and the ideal of the nuclear family that was cared for by the full-time housewife. It was, therefore, an ideology that acted to legitimise unequal employment opportunities between women and men and the lack of adequate child-care facilities.

Domesticity was undoubtedly accepted if not always whole-heartedly embraced by many relatively well-educated middle-class women. Nevertheless, it appears that there was a growing dissatisfaction amongst some of them, regarded as stemming from, "their underutilization as a social resource" (DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998a:5). As an articulation and analysis of this discontent Friedan's book *The Feminine Mystique* was published in the USA in 1963 and is regarded as adding fuel the emergence of the public face of feminism in the USA in a liberal form (Bouchier, 1983; Coote & Campbell, 1982; DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998a). A few years later, in 1966, Friedan became one of the founders the National Organisation for Women (NOW) in the United States, an organisation geared, primarily, towards promoting equal rights for women. According to DuPlessis and Snitow,

[NOW] was an attempt to institutionalize the drive for women's civil rights in the aftermath of the 1961 Presidential Commission on the Status of Women.
(1998a:5)

In this light, it might appear that the political arena in which NOW was intended to operate had already been prepared.

Yet, in Britain, the first form of visible, organised feminism to re-emerge in the Second Wave was not liberal in orientation. That this was so appears to be at least partly due to the weaker liberal tradition in Britain in the mid-Twentieth Century, unlike the USA (Bouchier, 1983:55-56). In addition, absent also in Britain was the extent to which a heightened liberal oriented concern with civil rights existed. As I will describe below, this heightened concern in the USA was brought about by the emergence of the Black Civil Rights Movement in the late 1950s. Rather than being a movement geared most strictly towards reform, when it emerged in Britain, organised Second Wave feminism is claimed to have been, "a revolutionary movement from the start" (Bouchier, 1983:55). The impetus for Second Wave feminism on both sides of the Atlantic in its more revolutionary forms is regarded as having been located within women's experiences in the radical politics that erupted in the 1960s (DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998a; Bouchier, 1983). As Coote and Campbell point out,

[r]adical politics in the 1960s provided an excellent breeding ground for feminism. Men led the Marches and made the speeches and expected their female comrades to lick envelopes and listen.

(1982: 13)

Therefore, what forms did these radical politics take and why did they 'erupt' on both sides of the Atlantic in the 1960s?

In order to explain these questions a closer look at the economic, political and social contexts in the aftermath of the upheaval of the Second World War is warranted. Here, I will attempt to provide an understanding of the relative political calm that these contexts created in the USA and Britain in the 1940s and 1950s and the subsequent unrest they unleashed in the 1960s. Nevertheless, by limiting my explanation to the post-war period I am not suggesting that the Second World War marked a complete rupture with the past history of either country. On the contrary, space constraints do not allow a tracing of ultimate 'origins'. However, the differences and similarities between the political contexts

that developed in a similar context of economic boom in the 1950s are, I believe, firmly bound up with the way prior history had been working itself out on either side of the Atlantic.

Bearing the above in mind, during the war, proponents of capitalism and communism had joined forces on the battlefield against the common enemy of fascism. After the defeat of fascism, with nothing to unite these proponents politically, the old barriers emerged between them with increasing strength. In the United States, any chances of an organised or visible left emerging to threaten capitalist ideals were quickly quenched by McCarthyism and its associated 'red-baiting' between the late 1940s and 1950s. In a sense, this represented an attempt at a thorough stamping out of anything that was viewed as seeking to threaten the liberalism that USA leaders claimed underpinned their society.

In Britain, however, socialism held a much stronger political position both before and after the war than it did in the United States. Nevertheless, it would appear that the combination of social policy reforms by Labour governments in the immediate years after the war plus the economic boom that followed the initial post-war slump did much to avert visible radical protest. Thus, compared to the USA, the left in Britain remained relatively well organised, indeed, part of formal politics, but appeased, perhaps, by welfare reforms and virtually full (male) employment that was created by the economic boom. Assessing the situation in post-war Britain before the 1960s Thane points out,

[t]he success of the post-war economy compared with that of the inter-war years and with what had been feared during the war, muted pressure from any but the most deprived and their supporters for more far reaching measures. The latter were relatively few in the euphoria resulting from the real improvements in the post- over the pre- war period.
(1982:267).

Basically, then, the processes of either welfare reform in Britain or the threat of brute force in the USA combined with economic boom seem to have ensured that organised, militant left-oriented social protest was averted. Thus, to map out how radical politics emerged in

the 1960s I will briefly address some of the main factors that seem to have fuelled it in each country in turn.

It would appear that one of the major catalysts for the emergence of radical politics in the United States, at least in its initial stages, was not seeking to overthrow liberalism or capitalism in the USA. This catalyst was the Black Civil Rights Movement - a movement with a long history in the United States - which began to gain growing visibility in the late 1950s. In a fashion that seems not completely dissimilar to liberal feminism in the USA, it was a movement that was speaking to and also critiquing the liberal ideals that were claimed to underpin United States society. As Freeman points out,

[t]he [Civil Rights Movement] was primarily a movement for inclusion into American society. A piece of the pie, equality for all, was its dominant theme even while it criticized that society.
(1998:184)

The reasons why the Black Civil Rights Movement emerged when it did do not seem to be difficult to understand. I mentioned above that after the war there was a hardening of the promotion of the liberal ideals that were claimed to underpin United States society in opposition to communism. In addition, after the war there was an economic boom that gained strength during the 1950s and a large proportion of white citizens were experiencing marked improvements in their living conditions and spending power. Nevertheless, particularly in the South, after the war the Black population had still not experienced inclusion within society on the very liberal terms that the United States was outwardly promoting to the world. Without addressing the course of events in any detail here, it must suffice to say that, within this context, the growing sense of injustice borne from the Black population's collective experiences of social inequality provided conditions that ignited the rise of the Black Civil Rights Movement in the late 1950s.

As the late 1950s turned into the 1960s the Black Civil Rights Movement, with gains amounting to no more than what it regarded as 'tokenism', did become more oppositional

as it entered its student-led phase (Chafe, 1981:71). This student-led phase gradually led to the splintering off of Black Power and a hardening of identity politics in the mid-1960s.

The Black Civil Rights Movement attracted many white sympathisers, both men and women, particularly among the student population, giving them a taste of and for organised politics. In addition, the demise of McCarthyism at the end of the 1950s, the strengthening of the cold war at the beginning of the 1960s and the outbreak of the war in Vietnam in 1964 gave rise to the development of a variety of New Left and other counter-culture movements among disillusioned young adults, primarily, from the student population. Contrasting the liberalism underpinning the initial drive for black civil rights with the perspectives underpinning the New Left, Freeman notes,

[t]he leftist perspective said inclusion was desirable only once society had changed sufficiently for equality to be meaningful. And the most meaningful change was one that destroyed capitalism.

(1998:184)

Speaking more generally about participants in these radical movements in the 1960s Bouchier says,

[b]rought up in peace and increasing affluence, with their ideals unsullied by the compromises of hard times, they arrived at maturity in the middle and late 1960s to find themselves in a crowded and a less than ideal world. Whatever its expression, their anger depended on one fundamental belief: that the world was within sight of the end of scarcity; that materially speaking, anything was now possible

(1983:51)

Similarly, in the 1960s, Britain witnessed a growth of counter-culture movements. These movements were protesting for peace and reacting against the straight-jacket of sexual restraint that was promoted by the strengthening of the ideal of the nuclear family in a world where technological and intellectual developments relating to human sexuality, nevertheless, seemed to be beginning to point towards sexual freedom. In addition, race riots did take place in Notting Hill in 1958 and also, "[t]he Powellite backlash against immigration... [in the 1960s led to] a long series of anti-racist campaigns by the left" (Bouchier, 1983:50). However, the differing histories of racial oppression in Britain and the USA appear to help to account for why, despite the inherent racism in the structures of its society, there was no political uprising based on 'race' within the geographical boundaries

of Britain in the 1960s on anything like the scale of the Black Civil Rights Movement and the later Black Power in the USA. Certainly independence struggles continued to take place off British soil during the decline of the British Empire. However, the non-white population did not really begin to increase within Britain itself until the mid-1950s. Thus, unlike the situation in the USA in the late 1950s, in Britain there was no single, relatively large ethnic minority group with a legacy of slavery that had taken place within its geographical boundaries and neither was there a formal system of segregation in operation.

Thus, although the Civil Rights Movement undoubtedly played a key role in paving the way for the New Left's reinvention in the USA in the post-McCarthyite era, socialism in Britain, despite its various factions and apparent lack of grass-roots militancy in the 1940s and 1950s, had an uninterrupted tradition consisting of a relatively stronger intellectual 'vanguard' and organised working class. Consequently, as the economic boom began to slow down in Britain in the 1960s and it became increasingly clear that the welfare state's delivery was falling far short of its promise, the context was shaped for a strengthening of socialist militancy alongside the counter-culture movements for peace.

It would appear that women's collective experiences of inequality within the, supposedly, 'egalitarian' movements of the 1960s on both sides of the Atlantic led them to question their low status in relation to men. In the USA more revolutionary socialist and radical forms of feminism are seen as being stimulated by white women's involvement in the Civil Rights Movement, the New Left and other counter-culture movements protesting for peace in general and, particularly, against the war in Vietnam (DuPlessis & Snitow 1998a; Coote & Cambell, 1982; Bouchier, 1983; Evans, 1980b). The hardening of identity politics with the formation of Black Power in the 1960s left a mark that did much to ensure that women's liberation groups, in the initial stages of their emergence, were almost exclusively white, or so it would seem. Describing and, seemingly, defending the lack of a black presence in these groups Freeman says,

[t]he message white women got from black activists was to stay away; our presence, our ideas, our whiteness, were oppressive. A couple of black women came to our early meetings but didn't come back. We accepted the fact that blacks wanted to keep their distance from whites and assumed this applied to other minority groups as well.

(1998:183)

With the formation of the National Black Feminist Organisation in 1973 and the Combahee River Collective in 1974 black women did begin to organise visibly yet separately from the, predominantly, white women involved in the Women's Liberation Movement. Certainly, as I will address below, tensions about the racism existing within the Women's Liberation Movement were beginning to surface more explicitly by the end of the 1970s. However, for the most part, it should be remembered that my exploration of the emergence of and developments within the Women's Liberation Movement on both sides of the Atlantic during the late 1960s and 1970s in the next two sections refers to a movement made up of women's groups that were predominately white and middle-class (Whelehan, 1995:107).

In Britain, the stimulation for the emergence of Second Wave feminism appears to be at least fourfold. First, it entailed women's active involvement and sexist experiences in socialist politics in the 1960s, which, in the face of increasing recession from around 1965 onwards, led to, "an unprecedented wages offensive at the end of the decade" (Coote & Campbell, 1982:18). Secondly, there was a general heightened awareness of issues related to 'personal politics', evidenced by the passage of the 1967 Abortion Act following liberal and humanist groups' campaigning after the 1962 thalidomide scare and also the passage of the Divorce Reform Act in 1969 (Bouchier, 1983:39). Thirdly, it included the influence of, "vague rumours of the women's movement in America and Germany" (Rowbotham, 1983:32) that were circulating by 1968 and, fourthly, there was the presence of feminist-oriented American women working for the peace movement in London (Rowbotham, 1983:35, Bouchier 1983:56). Nevertheless, even at the early stages of Second Wave feminism, political influence between the USA and Britain was not just one-way. This point is evidenced, for example, by the impact Juliet Mitchell's article, "Women: the Longest Revolution" appears to have had on some women in the United States when it was published in *New Left Review* in 1966 (Kesselman et al., 1998:29).

The questioning that led women to form Women's Liberation Groups on both sides of the Atlantic was partly related to inequalities in organising tactics and a mapping of these onto gender inequalities in men and women's roles in the processes of economic production. In addition, however, there was a gradual questioning of the extent to which the acting out of the ideas of sexual freedom within the Left and other counter-culture movements during the 1960s were, in fact, liberating for women. Jackson points out,

...the sexual revolution promised much but delivered far less. The ideas circulating within the Left and among various counter-culture movements of the time promoted 'free love', condemned marriage as a bourgeois institution which reduced people to possessions and, in principle at least, challenged the double standard of sexual morality. In practice, however, the consequences for women and men differed; in retrospect many women felt that the ideals of sexual liberation gave men greater access to women's bodies and removed our right to say 'no'....While the rhetoric of sexual liberation certainly did provide men with new ways of pressurising women into sex...it also placed sexuality on the political agenda.

(1999a:11)

The first women's groups that were to develop into the more revolutionary rather than liberal arm of Second Wave feminism seem to have emerged in the United States. Therefore, it is the USA context that I will address first.

6.3: The Women's Liberation Movement in the USA - Late 1960s and 1970s

It seems that the first women's liberation groups began to emerge in the USA in 1967 (Ruth, 1998:501). For the women involved, their political backgrounds are claimed to have shaped their thinking. As Freeman points out, "these backgrounds, gave us the frameworks through which we analysed the world and the vocabulary to articulate our thoughts" (1998:183), namely, anti-capitalist theories associated with Marxism and anti-Freudian revisionist psychology, which emphasised sexual freedom rather than repression.

Angered by their experiences in New Left politics, the first group of women began to meet in Chicago. Yet it appears that almost simultaneously, "women in Toronto, Seattle, Detroit, and Gainesville, Florida, had started small groups independently of each other and in turn

spread the word to others around them" (Freeman, 1998:182). Later that year, Shulamith Firestone, whose influential radical feminist text *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* was first published in 1970, moved to New York from Chicago and was one of the founding members of New York Radical Women (Freeman, 1998:181), the group from which the Redstockings emerged in 1969 (Bouchier, 1983:54). As the word spread, groups continued to multiply within and between cities. Indeed, in the USA, 1967 was the year when, "Women's Liberation movements [began] their rhizomic and effervescent growth" (DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998b:498).

There is no space here to detail the flurry of feminist thought and practical activity that began to arise during the ensuing months and years immediately following the formation of the first women's liberation groups in the USA. Insights into these can be gained from selective chronologies (e.g. DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998b: 496-512; Ruth, 1998: 501-505). What is clear though is that from its beginnings the Women's Liberation Movement was internally fractured between and among those who were labelled 'politicos' (broadly speaking, socialist feminists) and 'feminists' (broadly speaking, radical feminists) (Freeman, 1998:182).

Nevertheless, during the initial flurry of feminist activity, the broader radical political environment in the United States had begun to change. Describing the explosive context of the late 1960s Chafe says,

Black Panthers and Students for a Democratic Society tried to organize ghetto dwellers into a revolutionary phalanx to overthrow capitalism. Thousands of other young people, fed up with United States hypocrisy in Vietnam and the country's failure to solve problems of poverty and race at home, condemned the 'system'. Millions of adults, in turn, began to suspect that everything they cared about was being undermined by dissidents from another world...Whether one came from the left or the right, the country seemed under siege: for radical activists it was the brutal hammer of government repression; for 'middle America' it was the intolerance of self-righteous radicals.

(1981:172)

As protests became increasingly violent the government response, "was to crush the incipient rebellion with massive force" (Chafe, 1981:174). Divisions between those supporting the more liberal demands of the Civil Rights Movement and the more revolutionary and violent protests of Black Power already weakened Black unity. By the

end of the 1960s, the violent protests of Black Power as well as the New Left were crushed through curfews and police and military force. Consequently, it appears that established leaders from the more liberal edge of the Black Civil Rights Movement and the white population quickly began to try to seek ways to avoid further violent uprisings (Chafe, 1981:203-4).

In addition, in 1973, all land troops were withdrawn from Vietnam. In 1974, amnesty was granted to men who had evaded draft or deserted during the war. Finally, with the fall of Saigon in 1975 the war in Vietnam came to an end. In this respect, it might seem that one of the key motivations fuelling the peace movement in the USA had disappeared. Describing the situation that had arisen among participants in the radical movements within this broader context, Kesselman et al. state that, by the mid-1970s, "[t]he left had degenerated into a constellation of warring sects whose ideological disputes were seeping into the women's movement" (1998:50). These tensions in the left are seen to have been, "further exacerbated by the eruption of gay-straight splits in movement organisations" (McDermott, 1994:77). In short, widespread militant and relatively well organised campaigning was in decline.

Within the context of this changing broader political climate the Women's Liberation Movement is also claimed to have taken an increasingly inward looking turn. Earlier attempts to at least try to promote a unified sense of sisterhood appear to have given way to heated sectarian infighting and disputes about what 'true feminism' was. Thus, according to some commentators,

[b]y the mid-1970s the action-oriented visionary women's liberation movement...had dissipated, hard to sustain in the changed political climate. The radical wing of the movement focussed on building an alternative culture that was increasingly isolated from most people's daily lives, while the mainstream movement, led by NOW, fought important battles but rarely engaged in sustained grassroots struggles. Painfully absent was the sense of both the necessity and possibility of a radically transformed world.

(Kesselman et al., 1998:50).

Other accounts seem to challenge the sharp curtailment of activist oriented grassroots feminism among members of the Women's Liberation Movement that is, perhaps,

suggested above. Nevertheless, even here there does seem to be a sense of increased fracturing. Thus, as Tax points out,

[b]y 1977, the movement was in weird shape. A huge gap seemed to have developed between people doing practical work, who had little idea of how their work connected to anyone else's, and people doing theory, whose ideas were increasingly academic and cut off from practical consequence.

(1998:319)

Certainly, it seems that active campaigning remained most visible among NOW and other liberal oriented feminist groups. Indeed, Bouchier claims,

[m]ore highly professionalised, better funded, committed to democratic and legalistic procedures and dedicated mainly to the advancement of middle-class women, the liberal organisations...maintained much of their original identity through the 1970s.

(1983:139)

The run up to the deadline for the ratification of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA) to the American Constitution in 1978 provided a public platform for liberal-oriented feminist campaigns.¹ In addition, the US Congress' provision of a grant amounting to five million dollars enabled the staging of the First National Women's Conference in Houston, Texas in 1977, with an attendance of 20,000. Regarding the content of the National Plan of Action, which emerged from the conference, Bouchier claims that,

[t]he radicals had not been without influence. Nevertheless, the Plan of Action affirmed the essential liberal doctrine that the goal of social equality could be approached only through influencing government, not through revolution.

(1983:140)

Yet the formation of the Committee to Defend Reproductive Rights and the Committee for Abortion Rights and Against Sterilization, which campaigned against the cutting off of public funding for abortion in 1977, plus the staging of the first Take Back the Night marches in 1978 to protest against violence against women provide just a few examples of visible activism in the late 1970s that was not dominated by the liberal arm of feminism.

¹ The 1978 deadline was subsequently extended to 1982 when it was defeated. Although reintroduced in Congress in 1985 the ERA still has not been ratified. The ERA has three sections: 1. Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. 2. The Congress shall have the power to enforce, by appropriate legislation, the provisions of this Article. 3. This Amendment shall take effect two years after the date of ratification (Eisler & Hixon, 1986 reprinted in R  th, 1998:418). For a critical reflection on and evaluation of the failure to ratify the ERA during the 1970s and early 1980s see Mansbridge (1986).

Thus, while visible activism by the Women's Liberation Movement may have declined it had not totally disappeared.

However, despite these examples, on the one hand, intellectually, the mid-seventies do appear to have led to a strengthening of the desire amongst left-oriented women to reconcile Marxism and feminism. As, "a post-consciousness-raising effort to combine feminism with the goals of a study group" (Beneria, 1998:256), Marxist-Feminist study groups began to appear in the mid-seventies.

On the other hand, intellectually and practically, there was a growing interest in examining women's culture, which, "celebrated the 'female aesthetic' in art, music, dance, poetry, and spirituality" (McDermott, 1994:143). While neither exclusively a lesbian-oriented form of feminism nor supported by all lesbian feminists, it appears that this interest in women's culture did much to promote separatism and intensify tensions with feminists seeking to reconcile Marxism and feminism. These tensions continued through the late 1970s and heightened between the early and mid-1980s (McDermott, 1994:147).

During the course of the 'inward turn' that feminism is claimed to have taken from around the mid-1970s onward, the broader political context in the aftermath of the violence of the late 1960s and the falling apart of the New Left and other counter-culture movements had produced a backlash. Possibly as a reaction against the upheaval of the late 1960s and early 1970s, the country had taken a swing towards the Right. The effects of this political swing have already been evidenced above with the cutting off of public funding for abortion in 1977. In line with this political approach, personal and family issues were focussed upon by the New Right and Moral Majority in the run up to the Presidential elections in 1980, which produced a conservative landslide (McDermott, 1994:114).

The turn towards cultural feminism - celebrating the idea of female difference and women's unique nurturing capacity - and the growth of the feminist anti-pornography campaign in the late 1970s were regarded as dangerously in line with New Right politics

by feminists who did not support these particular developments. Regarding the campaign against pomography, McDermott claims that,

[b]y 1980, the anti-pornography campaign had gained hegemony over the movement's interpretation of 'the personal is political' while the alternate critique increasingly but unobtrusively challenged accepted notions about the nature and limits of female sexual pleasure...Ironically, the threat to anti-pornography feminists came from inside, rather than outside, the contemporary women's movement.

(1994:115)

Therefore, by 1980, it seems that the Women's Liberation side of feminism in the USA appears not only to have lost much of its public visibility but also to have become deeply divided. First, it was divided between those who were either endorsing or critiquing the turn towards celebrating women's culture. Secondly, it was on the verge of the 'sex wars' that finally erupted at the 1982 Barnard College Scholar and the Feminist Conference, which, closely related to the debates between anti-pornography campaigners and their critics, focussed on sexuality (Nestle, 1998:348; McDermott, 1994:115). Thirdly, the voices from within autonomous Black women's groups, as well as minority women within predominantly white feminist groups, began to become more widely audible within feminism during the late 1970s. It would seem that this third development was due, at least in part, to the forum provided by academic conferences and contexts (e.g. Omolade, 1998:388; Guy-Sheftall, 1998b:486; DuPlessis & Snitow, 1998b:510-511). As Omolade asserts,

...by the late 1970s there was enough of 'us' to create a 'Black sisterhood' unintended by the 'white' women's movement...In many ways, we were still part of an old civil rights mode that protested against the exclusion of Black people from anything that was white only. But we were not only protesting, but shaping and creating our own kind of feminist politics.

(1998:388)

Regarding the specific situation within academe, Guy-Sheftall states that,

[d]uring the late seventies, as the women's movement grew in momentum and as the Civil Rights Movement receded, it seemed, into the background, some Black women scholars left Black Studies or tried to infuse gender there - often a difficult enterprise. A few of us associated ourselves with Women's Studies and advocated loudly for paradigm shifts that would more adequately address race/class/ethnicity issues and eradicate frameworks that were constructed from the notion that 'woman' is a monolithic category. Others tried to maintain a foot in both camps so that Black feminist perspectives would permeate both disciplines, one of which had been historically insensitive to gender and homophobia, and the other one of which had been insensitive to race and class, and too bound up in Western epistemologies and cultural contexts.

(1998b:486)

The exposure and critique of the racism that was claimed to dog much feminist practical and intellectual activity throughout the 1970s, while not absent in earlier years, were beginning to become more visible.

Yet, despite the fractures that appear to have begun to deepen within the Women's Liberation Movement in the USA from around the mid-1970s, the apparent collapse of the broader context of visible organised activism and the USA's movement into, what has been termed, the 'backlash decade' of the 1980s (Faludi, 1991), it does appear that the academic arm of the Women's Liberation Movement was continuing to gain momentum within the institutionalised context of higher education. Using the numerical growth of Women's Studies programmes in the United States from the late 1960s through to the mid-1990s as an example will help to demonstrate that this was so.

In the United States it seems that Women's Studies courses and programmes began to emerge as a result of the pressure placed on higher education institutions by the vibrant on-campus women's liberation groups in the late 1960s and early 1970s (Torton Beck, 1990:13; Bird, 2002:141; Allen, 1996:155). According to Torton Beck,

[t]he earliest Women's Studies classes were typically taught off-campus by graduate students and untenured professors who were not paid for this work. Only after considerable protest did these classes finally become regularized as legitimate university offerings.

(1990:213)

Nevertheless, the first integrated Women's Studies programme was established in 1969-1970 at San Diego State University and was closely followed by a second at Cornell University in 1970-1971 (Boxer, 1998b). In terms of courses rather than programmes, it appears that there were at least seventeen in operation in the academic year 1969-1970. Yet by 1973, the number of courses and programmes had escalated to over two thousand and eighty respectively and continued to grow, reaching around twenty thousand courses and three hundred and fifty programmes in 1980 (Stimpson, 1986:4). Despite the political backlash that is claimed to have been effected by the New Right more generally within the United States, new programmes continued to appear during the 1980s. Indeed, by the end of the decade that is claimed to have, "produced one long, painful, and unremitting

campaign to thwart women's progress" (Faludi, 1991:454), the number of Women's Studies programmes totalled five hundred and nineteen (Tomnton Beck, 1990:13). Finally, by the mid-1990s it appears that over nine hundred programmes were in existence in the United States (Guy-Sheftall, 1995:2).

6.4: The Women's Liberation Movement in Britain - Late 1960s and 1970s

Not unlike the situation in the USA, it is clear that the seeds of collective consciousness were already beginning to be sewn among women in Britain around the mid-1960s. As I mentioned above, for example, Juliet Mitchell's article, 'Women: The Longest Revolution' was published in 1966. Here, Mitchell was influenced by Althusserian forms of Marxism that were gaining popularity in some circles within the intellectual 'vanguard' at the time yet critical of the absence of women within socialist theory. Thus, arguing against a crude reduction of women via the family to the economy, she drew on the concepts of 'relative autonomy' and 'overdetermination' to identify four separate structures - production, reproduction, sexuality and socialisation - which she claimed produced the complex unity of women's condition. Shortly after, although by no means simply as a direct result of this particular publication, according to Mitchell's own account,

[t]he first whisperings of the Women's Liberation Movement in England were late in 1967; by 1968 it was a named and organised movement.
(1986:43)

Nevertheless, the relatively well established nature of the Women's Liberation Movement in England, if not throughout Britain, by 1968 that is suggested by this statement is somewhat misleading. That this is so is evidenced, for example, in the brief account provided by Mitchell (1986) herself after making this statement and also in other descriptions of the emergence of Women's Liberation in Britain (e.g. Coote & Campbell, 1982; Bouchier, 1983; Rowbotham, 1983). However, in addition to, "the vague rumours of the women's movement in America and Germany" (Rowbotham, 1983:32) that were circulating in 1968, as well as the May 1968 uprisings in France, which had an enormous

impact on the British Left, other events were taking place that fuelled the subsequent formation of women's liberation groups.

For the purposes of trying to minimise the complexity of the messiness of reality, I admit that the sharp divide between the reformist and revolutionary arms of Second Wave feminism may have been over-stressed in this chapter thus far. Exposing the falsity of this divide, it seems that some of the key events that provided inspiration for the formation of women's liberation groups in Britain, at least among women on the left, were in fact concerned with equal rights. In 1968 fisherman's wives campaigned for the improvement of the safety of trawlers which led to the establishment of an equal rights group in Hull, initially comprising the working-class women campaigners, who later left, and left-oriented middle-class women. In addition, the three week 'Petticoat Strike' by women seeking equal rights in relation to male workers at Fords in Dagenham led more generally to, "a period of industrial militancy among women workers" (Rowbotham, 1983:34). An additional consequence was the establishment of a women's equal pay and equal rights trade union committee, the National Joint Action Committee for Women's Equal Rights, which staged a demonstration in May 1969 in Trafalgar Square. Reflecting on these events Coote and Campbell state that,

[n]ot unnaturally, these events had a formative influence on the newly emerging women's liberation movement.
(1982:18)

Indeed, advocates for working-class women within various left wing organisations, including, the Trotskyist International Marxist Group, the Revolutionary Socialist Student Federation, the International Socialists and the Communist Party, began to set up women's groups in 1969.

In addition to the groups set up by women in these specifically Marxist-oriented organisations, another group of predominately American women, who were involved in the peace movement, began to meet in London in 1969. It appears that this group proved to be highly influential among the groups that were collectively linked through the Earham

Street Women's Workshop in London when it was formed later that year. Speaking of the Workshop in the early 1970s Rowbotham says that,

[t]he Workshop had from the start a cheerful eclecticism. Any woman was welcome, 'communists, along with Maoists, Trotskyists, syndicalists, Seventh Day Adventists, nuns, anarchists, Labour Party members etc., in short feminists' (Irene Fick [*Shrew*, no.3, July 1969])

(1983:37)

Thus, by the end of 1969 Mitchell claims that in England, "many of the major towns had Women's Liberation groups and a number of the larger cities, particularly London, had several different organizations in operation" (1986:43). In addition, Bouchier (1983:59) points out that at least one group existed in Scotland and one in Wales.

Compared to the situation in the USA, it seems that the Women's Liberation Movement was less thoroughly dominated by students when it began its growth in Britain. Although I noted above that the student movements in the United States were falling apart by the mid-1970s, the Women's Liberation Movement in the USA appears to have initially emerged primarily out of existing campus-based radical movements (Rowbotham, 1983:43; Bird, 2002:141). In Britain, however, Rowbotham states that, "the student movement was already collapsing as women's liberation started, and the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign was already dead" (1983:43).

These differences might be due, in part, to the fact that the student population in Britain contained a much smaller proportion of the country's young adults than it did in the USA (Bird, 2002:141). Thus, as a comparatively weaker force it was perhaps more fragile from the start. Regarding the Vietnam Solidarity Campaign, one might speculate that the initial concern raised by the war when it commenced waned somewhat overtime in a country where the impact on human life was not felt directly. As I pointed out above, many of the first women's liberation groups in Britain arose out of various Marxist-oriented organisations. Admittedly, some of the women involved in these groups but by no means all were students. In addition, speaking more generally of the groups that began to emerge in the late 1960s and early 1970s Rowbotham states that,

[a]lthough the first groups tended to consist of students, later on they became less important. The women who have joined tend to be still predominantly middle class, in their twenties and thirties, housewives and white collar workers.

(1983:40)

Although groups had already begun to form in the late 1960s, the first National Women's Liberation Conference in Britain was staged at Ruskin College, Oxford in 1970. Describing her experiences as a member of the conference organising committee, Levin says that,

I think it was very spontaneous; none of us had any idea that it would escalate into such proportions...we thought perhaps fifteen to twenty people would come - a hundred people would have been considered a great success - ...But then the applications just poured in... There were over five hundred women.

(1990:46)

The National Co-ordinating Committee (NCC) was set up at the conference. The intention was that it would have a very loose structure, its primary function being to circulate information around the groups (Rowbotham, 1983:39). Certainly, at first, the NCC seemed to prove successful, working out the first four basic demands of the Movement that were, "designed simply to unite as many women as possible around the new campaigns" (Coote & Campbell, 1982:24). These demands were: equal pay; equal education and job opportunities; free contraception and abortion on demand; and free twenty-four-hour nurseries (Rowbotham, 1983:40; Bouchier, 1983:94; Coote & Campbell, 1982:24). These initial demands were later extended to seven: 'financial and legal independence' and 'an end to all discrimination against lesbians and a woman's right to define her sexuality' were added in 1975; 'freedom from intimidation by threat or use of violence or sexual coercion, regardless of marital status; and an end to all laws, assumptions and institutions which perpetuate male dominance and men's aggression towards women' was added in 1978 (Coote & Campbell, 1982:26).

In addition, the NCC was also responsible for organising demonstrations in London and Liverpool on International Women's Day in 1971 (Mitchell, 1986:44). Indeed, in terms of the emergence of women's groups it seems that, "the real growth came after the demonstration in March 1971" (Rowbotham, 1983:40), which, perhaps, provides evidence

of the success of the demonstration. Nevertheless, the NCC was dissolved in 1971 due to the opposition it attracted at the second National Conference. It seems that,

[a]lthough the committee had been devised initially to avoid any take over, its meetings had become a sectarian battleground, with the Maoists, in particular, trying to capture it. What the Maoists could do today the Trotskyists, or liberal reformists, or any other group could no doubt do tomorrow - and so it was decided at the Skegness conference that it was best to have no committee at all.

(Coote & Campbell, 1982:35)

As in the USA, the early years of the Women's Liberation Movement in Britain witnessed a flurry of practical and intellectual activity in the form, for example, of campaigns around issues connected to the movement demands and newsletters and other grassroots publications. This activity appears to have continued reasonably steadily throughout the 1970s in Britain (see eg Coote & Campbell; 1982; Bouchier, 1983; Humm, 1992). Yet the rapid growth of women's groups that occurred immediately after the International Women's Day March seems to have been short lived. After an initial 'peak' in 1971, Bouchier claims that,

[b]etween 1971 and late 1975 the number of functioning local groups had declined steeply, and growth continued only in areas where it had been slow to start - Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland. The structure of the movement had become entirely amorphous, based on a score of local women's centres, each with its associated small groups

(1983:122).

Admittedly, he adds,

[t]his appearance of decline was somewhat deceptive, however. What was happening instead was a radical acceleration of the movement's original impulse to decentralise. More and more women were choosing to work in very specific and limited areas of action, creating a network only very loosely linked by common commitments. In this way they hoped to avoid both the centralising tendencies endemic to the left and the destructive experience of factions struggling for control of the movement.

(Bouchier, 1983:122)

Certainly, unity was a factor that seems to have been strained in the early 1970s among and between socialist feminists from different Marxist organisations and those without formal connections to the left (Rowbotham, 1983; Coote & Campbell, 1982). Therefore, the loose structure may have helped to reduce conflict between different groups, allowing groups with different political tendencies to develop alongside each other. Nevertheless, tensions that appear to have been growing since the early 1970s, particularly around the

issues of sexuality and separatism, seem to have become more acute around the mid-1970s.

The first national lesbian conference was held in 1974 in Bristol (Bouchier, 1983:118). In addition, adding to the tensions within the Women's Liberation Movement was the emergence of 'revolutionary feminism' in 1977, which, although by no means supported by all lesbians, promoted separatism and was a development within radical feminism. These tensions, which had flared up during previous National Conferences, finally exploded at the 1978 National Conference and resulted in separate conferences being held for radical and socialist feminists respectively in the following years. Reflecting on her experiences as one of the organisers of the last National Conference, Hall, a socialist feminist, says,

[i]t was a very unhappy experience...It just turned into the most hideous argument between socialist feminists and radical feminists...
The conflict was around sexuality, but it wasn't just lesbianism versus socialism. I think at previous conferences it had always been found possible in the end, despite the difficulties and the passion, always you could come back to some form of consensus about 'We're all women here together'. It simply wasn't possible to do that any more.

(1990:173)

Visible activism did not disappear towards the end of the decade. For example, the National Abortion Campaign reached its height in 1979 with massive demonstrations against attempts to increase restrictions on the existing abortion law, Reclaim the Night marches were held in the late 1970s and Women Against Violence Against Women formed in 1980. However, it is clear from the above that the Women's Liberation Movement was deeply divided politically by the end of the 1970s.

Amidst the further loosening of the fragile moorings holding the local networks together in the late 1970s it seems that the 'different voices' of women of colour were also beginning to gain greater collective strength. The Black Women's Group had been formed in 1974 in Brixton and had managed to establish a black women's centre by 1980 (Whelehan, 1995:107). In addition, 1978 witnessed the formation of the Organisation of Women of Asian and African Descent (OWAAD). While disbanded in 1983, OWAAD staged its first

national conference in 1979, drawing together three hundred black women (Bryan et al., 1997:42).

On a slightly different note, Bouchier (1983:178) mentions the growing strength of the women's movement in Scotland in the latter part of the 1970s, highlighting its nationalist overtones. These distinctive nationalist overtones might seem to be linked to the more general heightened concern with nationalism within Scotland, in particular, since around the mid-1960s. After a slight 'dip' at the end of the 1960s, the concern with nationalism strengthened again and led to referendums on devolution that were held in Wales as well as in Scotland in 1979. Both referendums failed to produce a result in favour of devolution. However, while the subject of devolution might not appear to have been one that central Government wished to entertain during the 1980s this is not to say that consistent and successful nationalist politics disappeared. Consequently, three months after Labour had returned to power in 1997, a second referendum produced positive results in Wales and Scotland as well as in Northern Ireland.

Of course, during the emergence, growth and apparent heightening of tensions within the Women's Liberation Movement from the late 1960s to the end of the 1970s the broader economic and political contexts within Britain had not stood still. While certainly not suggesting that gender equality had been achieved in the public sphere, the Equal Pay and Sex Discrimination Acts of the mid-1970s, for example, meant that some formal gestures towards establishing the principle of equality at least in the workplace were beginning to be made. Yet, more generally, the economic recession that had begun to hit by the mid-1960s continued to deepen during the 1970s; inflation and unemployment continued to grow. Trade union militancy and industrial action intensified throughout the decade, yet, it would seem, to little avail. Although Labour returned to power in the form of minority governments between 1974-1979 after a swing back to the Conservatives in 1970, it was a party in crisis. Forced into an election in May 1979, Labour was crushed at the polls by, "a decisive and quite massive swing to the Conservatives" (Sked & Cook, 1993:323).

Shortly after the 1979 general election Wainwright, a socialist feminist, remarked,

[a]fter a decade of intense socialist agitation, more working-class people than ever in post-war years voted Tory at the last election. At the same time, fewer people than at any election since 1931 voted for the Labour Party. It seems then that as far as the mass influence of socialist politics is concerned, not only have we a long way to go, but in one respect at least we have not been moving forwards.

(1979:1)

Yet the concern that appears to have been sparked about the problem of disunity within the left in general as well as within the Labour Party among a number of people on the left by the publication of *Beyond The Fragments* (Rowbotham et al., 1979),² from which Wainwright's quote is taken, was, perhaps, somewhat belated. Socialism in general, the internally heterogeneous movement that socialist feminism, in particular, both worked alongside and was critical of, seemed to be falling apart. In short, the horse had already bolted. It would be eighteen years before the Conservatives would be thrown from power by a 'reinvented' Labour Party, in which socialist agitation from within had been drastically reduced not least by the curbing of trade union powers and expulsions of left activists during the 1980s.

It was Thatcherism, "which stressed the primacy of market forces, individualism and sound money" (Sked & Cook, 1993:330), that emerged out of the political, social and economic contexts of the late 1970s as the dominant ideology in Government. Moreover, New Right ideology continued to gain strength during the 1980s, legitimising and legitimised by factors such as welfare cut-backs, the deregulation of public services, the selling-off of council houses without building new stock, media portrayals of the 'loony left', the intensification of the spread of global capitalism and the increasing awareness from around the mid-1980s that communism in Eastern Europe was admitting defeat. Perhaps marking the final acceptance of the belief that as far as the fate of capitalism was concerned Marx had got it wrong, many intellectuals on the Left were trying to come to terms with what they regarded as 'New Times' (Hall & Jaques, 1989) by the late 1980s.

However, I am not suggesting that the broader culture of social protest, which appeared to have already fallen apart around the mid-1970s in the United States, came to an abrupt halt with the dawning of Thatcherism in Britain. At the beginning of the decade, racial tensions became acutely explicit during an outbreak of riots in several major cities in 1981 (Rowbotham, 1983:157; Sked & Cook, 1993:351). These riots were viewed as being produced by many factors, including,

...the economic recession which hit young people with little education the hardest; the decline of the inner cities; immigration; racial prejudice; crime, together with the fear which it inspired and the responses it occasioned.

(Sked & Cook, 1993:351)

In addition, industrial action continued to occur, including, "Britain's most bitter industrial dispute since 1926" (Sked & Cook, 1993:424), namely, the miners' strike of 1984-1985. Yet in the context of a general decline in British industry, the Government's refusal to make any compromises, the containment of trade union powers and the, "bitter internal wrangling" (Sked & Cook, 1993:424) within the Labour Party itself, collective industrial action continued to fail to bring about any changes in the system. Therefore, it is unsurprising that collective industrial action appears to have eventually tailed off after the mid-1980s.

Certainly, the intensification of the Cold War at the beginning of the 1980s, bringing with it an increase of USA land-based nuclear weapons to Britain, sparked a resurgence of peace protests, including the establishment of the peace camp at Greenham Common in 1981. Having become a women's only camp early in 1982, a protest staged at the end of that year drew together 30,000 women who joined hands around the airforce base (Humm, 1992:xix). Yet along with the rise of Gorbachev to power in the Soviet Union in the mid-1980s and his policies of *glasnost* (openness) and *perestroika* (re-structuring) came an easing off of the Cold War, and, of course, the eventual collapse of communism in Eastern Europe at the end of the 1980s. While protests at Greenham did not end in the

² As was evident in the 1980 British sample texts, three of the articles in *Feminist Review* (Margolis, 1980; Phillips, 1980; Wilson, 1980a) were explicitly informed by this publication and a conference fuelled by the publication was held in Leeds in 1980.

mid-1980s, momentarily, at least, the threat of war against Britain might have appeared to be substantially reduced.

Thus, it does seem that by the mid-1980s the broader culture of collective social protest that the Women's Liberation Movement in Britain had emerged in and been a part of, while not totally absent, was generally declining. As I mentioned above, internally the Women's Liberation Movement in Britain, while never internally homogenous, appeared to be already deeply divided by the end of the 1970s. Moreover, the impulse to decentralise that was inherent from its initial emergence appeared to have led to an increasing focus on local and specific concerns at the grass-roots level. Given these last two factors and the general climate set by the first, it is not surprising that visible grass-roots feminist activism in the form of large-scale campaigns and demonstrations is claimed to have substantially declined by the mid-1980s (Stacey, 1993:72). Around the same time, not unlike the claims about the relationship between academic and grass-roots feminism in the late 1970s in the USA (Tax, 1998), a gap between academic feminism and grass-roots activism is claimed to have appeared in Britain (Bird, 2002:145; Stacey, 1993:72).

Nevertheless, this is not to say that grass-roots activism itself had come to an abrupt halt. As DuPlessis and Snitow (1998a:19) argue about the USA context and is evidenced in the British context by the hundreds of organisations listed in the 1997/1998 *Women Making a Difference* directory, even by the late 1990s, "feminist activism [was] far from dead and...it [could] be found in numerous guises" (Halford et al., 1997:4). Moreover, the extent to which a gap had appeared between academic feminism and grass-roots activism would seem to depend on how one defines activism. According to Jackson,

...when lecturers take the subjective and experiential nature of women's studies into the apparently 'objective' academy; when we locate our personal feminism in the classroom; when we live our lives as feminists in academe; we are engaged in political activism...the very act of engaging in a women's studies course is feminist political activism.

(2000:10)

Not unlike the situation in the USA, in Britain, just as the Women's Liberation Movement might have seemed to be becoming increasingly internally fractured and less visible to the

public view in the chillier political climates of the 1980s, academic feminism appears to have been gaining greater visibility within the formal context of academe. Using the numerical growth of Women's Studies programmes within higher education institutions in Britain as an example will help to demonstrate that this was so. The figures below will demonstrate that real growth in academic feminism's visibility in higher education in terms of courses or degrees on offer that specifically focussed on women or gender does not appear to have occurred in Britain until the 1980s. However, it should be pointed out that despite academic feminism's apparent continued relative success in the area of research, concern was beginning to circulate about a decline in the number of Women's Studies degree programmes in Britain towards the end of the 1990s (Jackson, 1999b; Bird, 2001:475).

Key factors fostering the establishment of Women's Studies programmes in USA universities in the late 1960s and 1970s were the relatively large on-campus presence of women's liberation groups, the pressure these groups exercised for the development of courses and the fact that, "students had an unprecedented degree of control over what was taught" (Bird, 2002:141). In contrast, at the same time in Britain, not only was the Women's Liberation Movement less dominated by campus based groups but also, "students had no choice, they had to study what was offered by the official academy" (Bird, 2002:141). Thus, the key setting for the growth of Women's Studies courses in Britain during the 1970s was largely outside the official academy where provision was based more upon student demand - namely, in Adult Education settings provided by, for example, university extramural departments, Local Educational Authorities and the Workers Education Association (Kennedy & Piette, 1991; Duelli Klein, 1983). Yet by 1980 it appears that 'inroads' had been made and at least thirty universities were offering course options in Women's Studies (CEC, 1984). Moreover, 1980 also witnessed the establishment of the first named Women's Studies MA degree programme at the University of Kent (Duelli Klein, 1983).

The factors fuelling the growth of Women's Studies courses within higher education that occurred after the 1970s appear to be at least threefold. First, there was a shift towards a, "market led economy for higher education" (Skeggs, 1995:479). Secondly, there was an expansion of student numbers in higher education. This expansion was perhaps fuelled in part by the Government's need to 'massage' unemployment figures in a context where unemployment was continuing to rise, as well as by the more general, "longstanding British belief in education as one of the primary routes to social mobility" (Skeggs, 1998:479). Thus, this expansion created a pool of students, who, in turn, could create the demand for the expansion of Women's Studies within higher education - a pool that included many mature women students who had already been involved in feminist activism and/or Women's Studies classes in adult education (Skeggs, 1995:478). Thirdly, there was the continued, "perseverance and noble efforts of feminist teachers to consolidate feminist teaching" (Skeggs, 1995:479).

By the end of the 1980s, Women's Studies course options are said to have been available in most universities (Davies & Holloway 1995:13), there were ten Women's Studies Centres, at least nineteen MA programmes, two PhD programmes and, "a handful of institutions...offer[ing] part of an undergraduate degree in Women's Studies" (Zmroczek & Duchon, 1991:13). In 1990, two single honours degrees appeared (Bird, 2003:269). In 1998, seven institutions offered a single honours degree and twenty-five offered a joint honours degree in Women's Studies and six offered a joint honours degree in Gender Studies (Jackson, 1999b). In addition, a brief survey that I undertook of postgraduate courses listed in the 1998/1999 Prospects course directory revealed that there were at least forty-eight taught courses in Women's Studies (including those that mention women as part of the title, for example 'Women and Representation') twenty-five taught courses in Gender Studies (including those that mention Gender in the title, for example, 'Gender in Society') and at least eight Women's Studies doctoral programmes.

It is in light of this context of academic feminism's institutional growth and grass-roots feminism's apparent decline on both sides of the Atlantic that Whelehan claims,

[i]f one considers the achievements of feminism from the perspective of the '90's, feminism appears to have been a success story, at least in academic terms. Women's Studies courses are increasing, and the bookshops appear to be bursting with new publications dealing with issues of gender. Yet underpinning this academic success story is the reality that feminism as a political movement with a mass following has waned in both Europe and the United States of America.

(1995:1-2)

6.5: Reflective Summary: 1980 Texts in Contexts

No doubt the relatively unproblematic narrative of the historical emergence and decline of visible activism in the form of the Women's Liberation Movement that I have provided above is open to criticism for its oversimplification of a complex situation. Admittedly, in the last three sections I have merely summarised some of the factors and events that seem to be among the most relevant for understanding the rise and, what appears to have been, the demise of certain forms of visible feminist activism in the USA and Britain. However, the extent to which the sweeping, yet short, narrative I have told wavers from or distorts the historical pathways that were actually taken are questions that I must set aside for future debate. Nevertheless, my exploration of the post-war contexts in the first section furnishes some insights that suggest that the emergence of the Second Wave feminist movement in Britain and the USA was not an inexplicable accident. Instead, its emergence appears to have been stimulated by a renewed drive for civil rights in the USA in the late 1950s and 1960s and collective forms of left-oriented radical politics in the 1960s on both sides of the Atlantic. Moreover, these factors seem to have been fuelled by developments within the broader social, political and economic contexts in the period after the Second World War. In addition, I have suggested that the subsequent decline of something that was visible as an organised movement in the form of Women's Liberation was, again, not a sudden inexplicable event but fuelled by developments within and outside the Movement itself. I believe that the contexts provided above help to enhance understanding of the broad theoretical trends within the 1980 texts, which I will consider below. In addition, as I will suggest in the next section, I believe that these contexts begin to indicate towards certain factors that enhance understanding of the 1998 texts.

While all of the 1980 sample texts were published at some point during that year it cannot be assumed that they were all written either during that year or at the same point in the period prior to that year. Nevertheless, it seems reasonable to suggest that, with the exception of a very small number of texts (e.g. Brittain, 1980; Dall 1980), which are known to be reprints of work written before the emergence of Second Wave feminism, the vast majority of the 1980 texts were in the process of being written at some point during the late 1960s and 1970s. On a more general historical note, all of the journals in the sample first appeared at some point during the 1970s. In the USA, the first issues of *Feminist Studies* and *Signs* appeared in 1972 and 1975 respectively. *Women's Studies International Quarterly* first appeared in 1978. Although the Editor-in-Chief was based in Britain, the explicitly international nature of this journal means that it qualified for the USA as well as the British sample groupings. Finally, the first issue of *Feminist Review*, the second journal selected for the British sample group, appeared in 1979.

Regarding the theoretical perspectives in the 1980 texts, I suggested that historical materialist perspectives were much more evident than poststructuralist perspectives. Here, historical materialism was particularly apparent in more socialist feminist oriented rather than radical feminist oriented forms, but not exclusively so. In addition, with, perhaps, no more than one exception in the USA sample (Carroll, 1980), the key question concerning the texts that appeared to be influenced by historical materialist perspectives was not so much whether Marx's methods should be used. Instead, the key concern appeared to be more a questioning of in what way Marx's methods should be used. Now, from my descriptions in the last three sections it is evident that the New Left in the USA and socialism in Britain were key formative influences on the Women's Liberation Movement. Moreover, it appears that socialist feminism remained one of the key strands in the Movement throughout the 1970s. Therefore, it seems unsurprising that socialist feminist forms of historical materialism were fairly highly visible within the 1980 sample on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition, the proximity of the texts to the emergence of Second Wave feminism demonstrates that the project of attempting to fit women into Marxist frameworks was still relatively new even by the end of the 1970s. Furthermore, it

seems evident that theoretical and political differences would have already existed between women who belonged to different 'mainstream' Marxist groups - a factor that was seemingly more evident in my description of the British context. Consequently, it is unsurprising that debates existed about how to adapt Marxism for feminism within the 1980 texts exhibiting socialist feminist tendencies.

Nevertheless, as was clear from my descriptions in the last two sections, the internally heterogeneous tendency towards socialist feminism was not the only key tendency within the Women's Liberation Movement during the 1970s. Thus, it is not hard to understand why there was a reasonable amount of evidence of the other key tendency, namely, radical feminism, in the 1980 sample on both sides of the Atlantic. Certainly, the 1980 sample did reveal that some radical feminists had appropriated Marx's method. Yet in a number of cases it was less evident that others had done so. The essentialist tendencies exhibited by these particular accounts resulted from their exposure of sexism through the stressing of seemingly socially unaccounted for male values, norms or violence. In addition, my descriptions above provide an indication of how cultural feminism, which might be regarded as one of radical feminism's offspring, became increasingly visible from around the mid-1970s onward, particularly within the Women's Liberation Movement in the USA. Thus, although not entirely absent from the British sample, it is unsurprising that this strand of feminism was more visible within the USA 1980 sample overall.

The apparent lack of a strong liberal strand in the Second Wave grassroots movement when it arose in the late 1960s and 1970s in Britain would seem to help to account for the relative absence of texts exhibiting pro-liberal tendencies in the 1980 British sample. However, given that more strictly liberal oriented forms of feminism appear to have maintained their strength and visibility throughout the 1970s in the USA, the relative absence of texts exhibiting such tendencies within the 1980 USA sample might seem a little more difficult to understand. Yet my findings from the sample do seem to be in line with accounts that suggest academic feminism was more the daughter of the Women's Liberation Movement, which had a particularly heavy on-campus presence, rather than

the broader-based more strictly liberal-oriented groups (e.g. Nicholson, 1997:2; Allen, 1996:155).

Although accounts seem to suggest that the women's groups within the Movement were predominantly composed of white women, Black women do appear to have begun to form their own groups during the first half of the 1970s. Yet it seems that it was only towards the end of the 1970s that the critiques of these somewhat marginalised groups of Black women were beginning to become more generally visible. These factors might provide some understanding of why, while not entirely absent from either the British or USA 1980 sample texts, difference among women in terms of 'race' and ethnicity was not a central concern of the majority of the texts.

In addition, it is evident that tensions were mounting among feminists around issues related to sexuality during the late 1970s. Certainly these tensions were visible in the 1980 texts, albeit more so in the USA sample. However, as I indicated above, while proving to be highly divisive, it is important to point out that these tensions and debates do not appear to have arisen purely out of a simple demand for recognition of differences between women based on sexuality. Indeed, they appear to have been fostered by more complex concerns relating to separatism, anti-pornography and the meaning of sexual liberation and oppression - issues where differences between women are not necessarily always the central concern.

On the whole then, so far it does seem that an understanding of the emergence of and developments within the Women's Liberation Movement during the late 1960s and 1970s does begin to enhance understanding of the key broad theoretical trends I identified in the 1980 texts. However, it will become clear in the next section that the contexts of the late 1960s and 1970s also act as a springboard for understanding the broad trends that appeared to be evident in the 1998 sample, namely, the shifts towards greater attention to diversity and women's agency.

6.6: Reflection and Extension: 1998 Texts in Contexts

As I suggested above, by the mid-1980s the visibility of the Women's Liberation Movement in terms of certain forms of collective organising appears to have waned on both sides of the Atlantic. In addition, a number of accounts seem to suggest that a widening gap between grass-roots activism and academic feminism had appeared. Therefore, it does not seem appropriate to continue my exploration of the texts' broader contexts in a manner that seeks to identify the nature of specific grass-roots activities. Consequently, rather than attempting to 'coax' material into a fashion that resembles a relatively straightforward narrative, I will continue my explorations in a much more tentative fashion. In so doing, I will draw on the descriptions of the broader contexts that I provided above and extend them. Thus, in order to attempt to understand why there might have been a general intellectual shift towards taking more account of diversity and women's agency, I will propose a series of factors that seem to be among those that might be relevant. I am neither claiming that the factors I mention represent an exhaustive list nor suggesting that further interrogation of the factors I do highlight is unnecessary. For the purposes of clarity, I will address each shift in turn. However, it will become evident that the shifts do not appear to be totally unrelated to each other. Moreover, again for clarity, when addressing each shift I will address each factor individually. Nevertheless, it is important to remember that, according to Mannheim (1952a), rather than existing in isolation from each other, in reality these factors form part of a larger historically dynamic constellation.

6.61: Greater Attention to Diversity

I focussed attention on the emergence of and developments within the Women's Liberation Movement during my descriptions above and I suggested that women who joined the groups within the Movement were, at least initially, predominantly white. However, the first point I will emphasise is that this particular identity based movement was not the only identity-based movement to have arisen in the 1960s. The Black Civil

Rights Movement and Black Power, which seem to have been among the factors fuelling the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement in the USA, and Gay Liberation were vying for the recognition of specific oppressions. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that the demand for the public recognition of these additional specific identities and oppressions over time would have created an arena for growing critical reflection on split allegiances. Moreover, as was evident in my descriptions above, with regard to 'race' and ethnic differences, not only had the number of black feminists risen significantly by the end of the 1970s but also black feminists were increasingly interacting with and moving into the same intellectual spaces as white feminists. Additionally, Guy Sheftall (1995) points out that the passage of time has allowed for the broadening and deepening of international links between feminist scholars. She highlights that the expanding movement in Africa and the Third World in particular had begun to add force to the critique of Anglo-American academic feminism's eurocentricism by the 1990s.

Thus, factors relating to gradual recognition of the validity of the claims of other identity based movements and their implications for feminism may help to provide some understanding of the increase in the struggle to seek commonality across multiple lines of difference without erasing those very lines. Although, as Boxer (1998b:112-114) points out, academic feminism's journey towards accepting and interrogating hierarchical differences between women was often a painful one. More generally on the left, however, the increasing recognition and acceptance of differences between people that appears to have occurred has not always led to analyses that seek to problematise them as hierarchical differences. That this is so is evident in the post-Marxist approach taken by Laclau and Mouffe (1985), who are seeking a way to build unity within the left following the recognition of differences other than class. For example, they state,

[t]he strengthening of specific democratic struggles requires, therefore, the expansion of chains of equivalence which extend to other struggles. The equivalential articulation between anti-racism, anti-sexism and anti-capitalism, for example, requires a hegemonic construction which, in certain circumstances, may be the condition for the consolidation of each one of these struggles. The logic of equivalence, then taken to its ultimate consequences, would imply the dissolution of the autonomy of the spaces in which each one of these struggles is constituted; not necessarily because any of them become subordinated to others, but because they have all become, strictly speaking, equivalent symbols of a unique and invisible struggle.

(Laclau & Mouffe, 1985:182)

I believe that Laclau and Mouffe's (1985) call for the recognition of the equivalence of difference in the struggle against oppression *per se* appears over simplistic because it seems to ignore serious interrogation of the hierarchy differences do create between people within and between the groups they mention. Surely, this type of interrogation would be necessary in order to create the very alliances they seek to build?

Secondly, it is, of course, also possible that the extreme individualism of the 1980s New Right politics might have played a part in influencing the movement towards greater concern with the concept of difference between women. Here, I am suggesting that the general context, where, on the one hand, visible collective activism appeared to be in decline and, on the other hand, individualism was being generally promoted as the only legitimate ideology, might have sensitised a feminist concern with the uniqueness of individual women, leading towards more or less critical incorporations of the dominant political ideology. Moreover, within this ideological context Skeggs points to the individualistic nature of the popular form of feminism that was increasingly promoted through the British media, which, "provided access to a consumer entitlement oriented feminism centred on individualist enterprise not dissimilar to Thatcherism" (1995:478). Here she highlights the increased promotion of 'star' feminists and the development of a glamorous "Madonna form" of feminism within the media. The promotion of "girl power" in the 1990s through popular music might seem to be but one example of the lingering effects of New Right ideology in the post-Thatcher and Reagan eras. With regard to academic feminism, it is important to point out, however, that it was not simply that difference was favoured over sameness in the majority of the 1998 texts, rather it was more a desire to get to grips with the tensions between the two concepts. Thus, the approach that was generally visible in the texts perhaps marks a critical incorporation and interrogation of the popular form of feminism that was promoted by the media.

Thirdly, it also seems plausible that more global factors played a part in drawing greater attention to differences among women than was evident in the 1980 texts. Factors such as the changing nature of capitalism, including, for example, the growth of transnational

corporations and the exportation of industry to previously less 'developed' countries, the growing interdependency of nations and developments in communications technology seem to have begun to catch the attention of the academic community more generally in the 1980s. On the whole, these factors tend to be regarded as having speeded up since the 1970s and appear to have contributed to a heightened sensitivity to the concepts of sameness and difference in a global context at least within some circles of the academic community (McGrew, 1992). In addition, events in the 1990s not only in Eastern Europe, following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1989, but also, within Britain, in Scotland and Wales, appear to have been among those that ushered in a heightened concern with nationalism among many in the broader academic community (e.g. Calhoun, 1994; Woodward, 1997).

Fourthly, it is possible that the concern with hierarchical differences among women, in particular, was partly fostered by a critical reaction to the shift towards agency. Admittedly, I noted that this second trend in the 1998 texts was not generally one in which agency was regarded as free-floating but constrained within broader material and/or cultural contexts. However, it seems plausible to suggest that critical reaction to a greater concern with agency from academic feminists whose personal or professional background linked them to less 'privileged' groups of women may have prompted a wider recognition of the fact that not all women are able to exercise agency equally. Yet rather than this being a response prompted by a purely immanent shift in knowledge I will suggest below that a combination of a number of non-theoretical factors may help to account for the apparent shift. Here it will also become clear that the shift towards greater acknowledgement of difference and the shift towards greater acknowledgement of women's agency might, in some respects, appear to be mutually reinforcing rather than separate shifts. This is not to say, however, that difference and agency are addressed in a similar fashion in all accounts - indeed, differences between accounts were evident within the sample.

6.62: Greater Attention to Agency

In her discussion of trends within feminist sociology in the mid-1990s, Roseneil suggests that the theoretical shift towards agency is, "indicative of our maturation" because it allows for the possibility of considering, "the ways in which women resist and challenge, as well as take part in, their own subordination" (1995:201-202). I am aware that some may criticise the use of the term "maturation" on the grounds that it might appear to conjure up a vision of "progressive evolution" - a vision that seems to be discredited within some contemporary academic circles (Poovey, 1995). However, given that the theoretical shift towards agency is not something that has been restricted to academic feminism (Delanty, 1997), what concerns me here is not simply whether the shift might be a sign of academic feminism's "maturation". Instead, of greater concern here is the question of whether the shift towards agency is indicative of its specific rooting in time and space. In order to consider this question, I will suggest a series of factors that might contribute to an understanding of the apparent shift, each of which require deeper investigation than that which I can provide within the context of this project. So, in order to compare how the historical situation may have shifted I will begin by attempting to reflect a little on why the 1980 texts might have tended to stress structure at the expense of women's agency.

Admittedly at least on the surface appearing to tend towards the "maturation" thesis, I suggest that the proximity of the 1980 texts to the emergence of the Women's Liberation Movement may have something to do with their emphasis on structure. In the first place, I suggested above that the Movement had emerged out of the radical politics of the 1960s and had been influenced by radical movements that themselves had been protesting against the oppressive effects of structures. In addition, although looking back through 21st Century eyes may make it difficult to grasp the enormity of the task because of the amount of work that has been done, when the Movement emerged both politically and intellectually it was, as the title of Firestone's (1970) book reminds us, very much concerned with making a case for feminist revolution. Therefore, it seems reasonable to suggest that key issues would have been identifying, naming and stressing oppressions in

order to make this case when the Movement emerged and, due to the enormity of the task, these issues were still high on the agenda throughout the 1970s. Now, I am in no way suggesting that by the 1990s everyone believed that women are oppressed, although when addressing the context in academe in the USA at least one feminist academic does seem to believe that, "[i]n most humanities and social science disciplines today feminist inquiry has achieved undisputable legitimacy - in some, a level of acceptability approaching normalcy" (Stacey, 1995:312). In addition, I am not implying that all of the ways that women are oppressed had been 'discovered' by the 1990s or that revolution had taken place. Instead, what I am suggesting is that the historical situation had changed.

First, the shift towards agency might be related, in part, to the decline in the belief that revolution in the conventional sense of the term is possible. Indeed, even by the end of the seventies Eisenstein was urging feminists in the USA to recognise that they were no longer in a revolutionary situation (1981:342). Thus, the strengthening of the Right's anti-feminism in both countries during the 1980s, particularly in relation to private sphere issues, coupled with the declining context of visible collective protest may help to account for a growing concern among academic feminists with how women deal with oppression under such circumstances. Consequently, it seems possible that this concern may have led some feminists to focus more sustained attention on attempting to analyse the, "quiet female resistance" of individual women (Faludi, 1991:454). Thus, greater attention to women's active resistance may have been propelled, at least in part, by the need to figure out new ways for effecting radical social change in the non-revolutionary context of New Right anti-feminism where visible forms of collective activism had declined.

Secondly, while the strengthening of the 'ideology of domesticity' appears to have been part of the New Right's anti-feminist backlash, particularly in the USA, I mentioned earlier that the New Right politics of the 1980s also heralded a reassertion of extreme individualism and free-competition. Although I have already suggested that the emphasis on the uniqueness of the individual may have influenced greater attention to the concept

of difference, I believe it may also have influenced a shift towards greater attention to agency. In addition, perhaps, reflecting a slight tempering of and also a reaction to the effects of these extremes among the general population, the 1992 presidential elections in the USA had heralded the return of the Democrats in the USA. Likewise, the 1997 elections in Britain had marked the return of the Labour Party to power, albeit in a 'reinvented' form, as I suggested above. Now, the sample I used in the last two chapters did not track intellectual shifts between 1980 and 1998, therefore, the effects of New Right politics at its height on academic feminism has not been examined. Consequently, it is difficult to ascertain the extent to which the extreme individualism of the 1980s New Right politics, which had gained strength within specific historical contexts, might have been uncritically incorporated into academic feminism during the 1980s. Therefore, it is possible that the general trend I identified in the 1998 texts might mark more of a turning back from a 1980s shift towards a relatively free-floating notion of agency rather than a straight movement from structure towards agency *within* structures.

Thirdly, it also seems plausible to suggest that the greater attention to agency I identified in the 1998 texts may be related to the gradual recognition of the need to attend to hierarchical differences between women. Would not the recognition and acceptance of the fact that women are not only oppressed but also oppressors of other women require an acknowledgement of women's agency? Moreover, as I suggested above, the gradual recognition of hierarchical differences between women does not appear to have been fuelled solely by immanent developments in knowledge.

Fourthly, just as academic feminism itself was continuing to strengthen its position within academe, 'improvements' that may have appeared to have taken place in certain areas of women's lives more generally might have weakened or, at least, changed the terms upon which, arguments for the recognition of women's oppression were based. As a result, this might have played a part in fuelling a movement towards investigating women's agency, albeit regarded as more or less unfettered in different accounts. That this might have been a contributory factor can be illuminated by using figures for employment and higher

education enrolment as examples of two areas where some women appear to have begun to make increasing gains.

I am in no way implying that vertical or horizontal segregation in the labour force disappeared between 1980 and 1998 or that the gains that might appear to have been made were proportionately uniform across lines of stratification such as class and 'race'. However, when women are considered as a group, figures on both sides of the Atlantic for employment seem to suggest that certain changes had occurred between the 1970s and mid-1990s. In the USA women's labour force participation rate rose from 43.7% in 1970 to 51.5% in 1980 and had reached 58.9% by 1994 (Rotella, 1998:347). In terms of the earnings gap, while remaining relatively stable between 1970 and 1980 with women earning on average around 60% of the earnings of men, by 1994 the average gap had narrowed to 74.6%. Taking a longer-term view, between 1960 and 1994, "women's real (that is, inflation adjusted) earnings rose 42 percent while men's rose only 18 percent" (Rotella, 1998:353). Rottella also suggests that the, "rapid rise in women's earnings in the 1980s and 1990s reflects [the] rise in education and experience [in terms of length of uninterrupted employment]" (1998:354). In addition, between 1980 and 1990 the percentage of women managers rose from 30% to 42% (National Council for Research on Women, 1996).

In the UK³, women's economic activity rates, which include, "the unemployed who are actively seeking work" (Walby, 1997:28) as well as those in employment, rose from 51% to 73% between 1975 and 1993 (Walby, 1997:28). Yet, in contrast, between 1973 and 1993 men's economic activity rates fell from 93% to 86% (Walby, 1997:28). In addition, the percentage of women in the workforce rose from 38% in 1971 to 42.6% in 1981 and continued to rise, reaching 48.2% in 1991 and 49.6% in 1995 (Walby, 1997:27). However, admittedly, much of the rise in women's labour force participation that has occurred has been in part-time employment. Indeed, while 34% of women in the labour force worked

³ The figures for employment and education include those for Northern Ireland as well as England, Scotland and Wales.

part-time in 1971 the figure rose to 47% by 1993 (Walby, 1997:32). Thus, in 1993, 53% of women in employment in the UK were working full-time, compared to 66% of women in the USA in 1995 (Rotella, 1998:353). In terms of the earnings gap, the hourly earnings of women in full-time employment narrowed from 63% of men's hourly earnings in 1970 to 73% in 1981 and 80% in 1995 (Walby, 1997:31). In addition, the percentage of economically active women who were professionals, employers or managers rose from 5% to 13% between 1975 and 1994 (Walby, 1997:35). Along with noting the importance of equal opportunities legislation since the 1970s for helping to reduce discrimination, Walby (1997:22) highlights the importance of increased access to higher education since the 1970s and, "the declining significance of domestic activities for some women" to account for younger women's comparative 'success' in the labour force in the UK.

I do not deny that gender differences persist in the types of subjects studied, however, the figures relating to women's participation in higher education show a significant increase during the last three decades of the 20th Century. In the USA, a substantial increase in the numbers of women in higher education was already taking place in the 1970s. Yet it seems reasonable to suggest that the effects of this increase on women's position in the workforce might only have begun to manifest themselves by the end of the decade. Between 1966 and 1975 the number of women attending college rose from 2.5 million to over 5 million. This rise appears to have been fostered, in part, by changes to the Education Amendments Act in 1972. By 1979 there were already more women college students than men in the USA. The figures continued to rise throughout the 1980s, albeit not so steeply, reaching a total of over 8 million by the mid-1990s, when 55.1% of college students were women (National Council for Research on Women, 1996).

The proportion of the population enrolled in higher education in the UK is much smaller than in the USA. However, the numbers of men and women in higher education increased quite significantly after the North American model of mass education was adopted in the late 1980s (Morely, 1999:33). As a result, "one in three young people entered higher education in 1995/6 compared with one in six in the late 1980s" (ONS, 1998:61). In terms

of women's participation in relation to men, in 1970 women made up only one third of the student population yet by the mid-1990s they made up just over 50% (ONS, 1998:61). In 1970/1971 there were 173 thousand full-time women undergraduate students enrolled in higher education and 19 thousand part-time, these figures rose to 196 and 71 thousand respectively in 1980/1981, 319 thousand and 148 thousand respectively in 1990/1991 and reached 529 thousand and 310 thousand respectively by 1995/1996. The number of women postgraduate student enrolments rose from 10 thousand full-time and 3 thousand part-time in 1970/1971 to 21 thousand full-time and 13 thousand part-time in 1980/1981 and reached 60 thousand full-time and 89 thousand part-time in 1995/1996. The percentage of postgraduates who were women rose from approximately 21% in 1970/1971 to just over 32% in 1980/1981 and had reached just over 46% by 1995/1996 (calculated from statistics in *Social Trends*, ONS 1998:61).

I am aware that the figures I have provided may have the effect of overemphasising the extent to which the changes that occurred in employment and education between the 1970s and 1990s had generally resulted in 'improving' women's prospects. Regarding women's participation in employment Walby points out, "[t]here are major debates as to whether increased employment significantly impacts on the position of women in society and whether it reduces gender inequality" (1997:23). Certainly, participation in paid employment may actually result in increasing married women's inequality due to their 'double-burden' of paid and unpaid labour.

However, I think it is neither conceding too much nor totally implausible to suggest that, notwithstanding persisting inequalities, the relative gains that appear to have been made in certain spheres allowed more women to publicly demonstrate their ability to exercise agency in the 1990s. If this were not so, then were the first two demands of the British Women's Liberation Movement relating to employment and education opportunities totally misguided? Admittedly, such 'improvements' may have brought with them new contradictions. As was evident in a number of the 1998 texts, despite the apparent increased attention to women's agency, many authors were *not* simply celebrating

women's agency. Instead, they appeared to acknowledge that women do exercise agency but *within and against* constraining structures.

Fifthly, a turn towards taking more account of women's agency might, in part, be related to the processes involved in developing studies in which generalising concepts are not uncritically applied but interrogated - studies, which may have been prompted, in part, by calls to turn away from abstract generalising theorising. These studies include, for example, the specific type of 'middle range' approaches that Maynard (1990) observed as growing within feminist sociology where inductive as well as deductive processes are evident (de Groot & Maynard, 1993; Maynard, 1995). Now, while this may hint towards an emphasis on immanent development I want to suggest that this may not be solely the case.

During my analysis of the 1980 texts it was evident not only that differences existed between those tending more towards radical arguments and those tending towards socialist arguments - the two main tendencies that seemed apparent - but also that differences were evident within these perspectives. Now, taking those tending towards socialist tendencies as an example, the struggle to fit women into existing non-feminist Marxist frameworks appeared to represent a struggle to deal with the inadequacies that were believed to reside within these existing accounts. However, it was also evident that the struggle was not only producing different accounts but also that each account still seemed to be regarded by a number of the authors as an unfinished project. That is to say, the project was not regarded as providing an adequate explanation of women's oppression. Indeed, as I noted above, at least one author who explicitly addressed the differences between attempts to synthesise Marxism and feminism in the 1980 sample was questioning whether it was in fact time to abandon the project. Moreover, while used to build an argument for "A More Progressive Union" of Marxism and feminism it was the very question of the possibility of synthesis that formed the basis for Hartmann's (1979) essay, which itself acted as the lead essay for a collection published two years later (Sargent, 1981). In addition, what I believe does seem to be evident in Barrett's analysis

of what she regarded as 'The Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis', which was first published in 1980, is a suggestion of how to begin to overcome some of the problems. Here, Barrett appears to call for a movement away from both abstract theorising and the uncritical application of generalising concepts, such as 'patriarchy', during empirical studies. With regard to this particular concept she argues that,

(t)he resonance of this concept lies in its recognition of the trans-historical character of women's oppression, but in this very appeal to longevity it deprives us of an adequate grasp of historical change. How useful is it to collapse widow-burning in India with 'the coercion of privacy' in Western Europe, into a concept of such generality? *What we need to analyse are precisely the mechanisms by which women's oppression is secured in different contexts, since only then can we confront the problem of how to change it.*

(Barrett, 1980:250, emphasis added)

Now, the particular directions in which Barrett's own work has travelled and worked its way out after making these claims in 1980 is not my specific concern here⁴. Analysing these directions would require a detailed investigation of how her particular placing within and interaction with, what Mannheim (1952a:134) regards as, the constellation of factors that make up social life has worked itself out in her own work⁵. In addition, I realise that it is *oppression* rather than *agency* that appears to be stressed within the above quotation. However, it seems possible to argue that by responding to calls for a movement away from abstract generalising theorising the *processes* involved in conducting critical empirical investigations would neither be merely contemplative nor simply providing food for intellectual reflection on how to confront oppressions after the investigation had taken place. Instead, might not the very act of conducting such investigations also reveal the ways in which women do confront it, thereby, highlighting women's agency? In addition, as an argument feeding off and feeding into other emerging factors, might not more specific critical studies also highlight differences between women? Now, I realise that this may appear to hint at an immanent understanding. Yet I believe that it only appears as such if intellectual work itself is regarded as a purely contemplative act. It is not simply my

⁴ See, for example Barrett (1991) *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault*. Here, as the title suggests, we see how compared to the criticisms she makes in *Women's Oppression Today* (1980) of the growing visibility of, what might be termed, emerging poststructuralist approaches - Lacanian and Foucauldian forms, in particular (see esp. chs 1, pp.29-38 and 3) - that were developing out of reworkings and critiques of Althusserian Marxism in Britain at the time, Barrett herself has come to "nail [her] colours to the mast of a more general post-Marxism" (1991:vii).

⁵ This is the type of more detailed investigation that would take place during the second phase of Mannheim's third stage.

argument that the recognition of the inadequate fit between knowledge and other social factors may have influenced the type of investigations that seem to have been called for and subsequently carried out by some academics. Instead, I am suggesting that the processes involved in certain types of investigations that are carried out by some academics who have moved away from abstract generalising theory require *interacting* with social factors. Moreover, these social factors have, in part, influenced the call generating this movement and are, themselves, historically dynamic. Thus, changes in the ways academic feminist work is carried out may be a factor fuelled by and fuelling greater concern with difference as well as agency.

Sixthly, emerging with the growth of cultural feminism and the heightening tensions leading up to the 'sex wars' was a concern to attempt to more thoroughly get to grips with, "the convoluted alliances between [women's] 'natural' and [women's] 'nurtured' self" (Stimpson et al. 1980:1). This concern was evidenced, for example, in the articles in the double special issue on *Sex and Sexuality* in the USA 1980 sample. Calling for greater attention to understanding the body in a manner that neither denied its physical reality nor reduced women to it, the editors of *Signs* were urging feminists to regard, "the body [as] simply an element of our being, to be understood and intelligently accepted" (Stimpson et al. 1980:2). Now, the perceived, relatively unproblematic nature of getting to grips with this task that might appear to be implicit within the editors' view of the body, might, with hindsight, seem to have been rather over-optimistic. Nevertheless, by the late 1980s and 1990s the greater emphasis placed on interrogating essentialism by using the body as the site of departure was evident (e.g. Bordo, 1993; Butler, 1993; Gallop, 1988; Jaggar & Bordo, 1989). Therefore, the greater attention to interrogating, "the convoluted alliances between [women's] 'natural' and [women's] 'nurtured' self" (Stimpson et al. 1980:1) by using the body as the site of departure might have, in part, influenced as well as have been influenced by a general shift towards greater attention to women's agency.

I believe all of the factors I have mentioned thus far in this section help to show how the movement towards greater attention to agency and difference that was generally evident

in the 1998 texts might have been influenced. I am certainly not claiming to have exhausted all of the possible factors but rather to have highlighted some of those that appear to be among those that might be relevant. Clearly, whether or the extent to which and the ways in which each of these factors actually did influence specific texts in the sample is a matter that requires further investigation. Moreover, I realise that the arguments I have made in relation to the majority, if not all, of the factors could be turned on their heads. Why, for example, should the factors I mentioned necessarily prompt greater recognition of and sensitivity to difference - albeit manifested most frequently in a manner that attempted to struggle with the tensions between difference and commonality? Is it not also possible that a number of the factors could have prompted a strengthening of the features that were evident in 1980 texts?

When each factor is looked at individually, as I have tended to do so above purely for the purposes of trying to make a messy situation appear reasonably clear, then I believe that many of the individual arguments I have made could, indeed, be turned on their heads. However, it is important to emphasise again that, according to Mannheim, social factors do not exist in isolation from each other but form part of a larger historically dynamic constellation. If the factors I have mentioned are regarded as existing in dynamic relation to each other I believe that it makes it more difficult to argue that they would result in a strengthening of an emphasis on structure and homogeneity at the expense of agency and difference. Whether this is a misguided belief and whether I have ignored other factors that might make it difficult to make a case for the interrelationship between the most general intellectual shifts that I identified in the sample texts and their broader contexts are questions that appear to require further research.

6.7: Conclusion

During this chapter, it has become evident that Hypothesis Four appears to be confirmed, namely, intellectual shifts seem to be related to shifts within their broader material and

cultural contexts. Admittedly, by stressing the general shifts that appear to have occurred between 1980 and 1998 I realise that I am open to charges of underplaying the fact that attention to diversity and women's agency was evident in some of the texts in the 1980 sample. Nevertheless, when viewed in relation to the 1998 sample I believe it was clear that these particular features were much less of a concern in the 1980 sample as a whole. Indeed, I hope that I have shown that the factors that might enhance understanding of the general shifts did not represent a complete break from the past but rather emerged within the larger historically dynamic constellation of factors that Mannheim argues make up social life. Therefore, it is unsurprising that there was already some evidence of attention to the interrogation of diversity and women's agency within the 1980 sample. Yet whether a more detailed examination of the similarities and differences between individual authors' professional, political and personal backgrounds can enhance understanding of which authors were more likely to have addressed these specific issues in the 1980 sample or, more generally, which authors were more likely to have been influenced by historical materialist, poststructuralist or some other perspective in either sample remains to be answered.

Chapter Seven: Reflection and Conclusion

The whole life of an historical-social group presents itself as an interdependent configuration; thought is only its expression and the interaction between these two aspects of life is the essential element in the configuration, the detailed interconnections of which must be traced if it is to be understood.

(Mannheim, 1968:278)

7.1: Introduction

During the process of conducting this study I have been guided by one central, underlying question, namely, "What relationships exist between the changing perspectives, themes and contexts of academic feminism in Britain and the USA?" It is clear that, while acting as a driving force behind my investigations, a specific answer to the question in terms of stating the particular causes and directions of influence in individual cases has not been revealed within the context of this project. Nevertheless, by establishing that relationships appear to exist, the stage has been set for future research, which I will address below. Fuelled by a mixture of personal, political and intellectual motivations and linking in to wider debates within academic feminism, I set out to examine four hypotheses, using Mannheim as my guide. These hypotheses are:

- 1) A shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA during the 1980s and 1990s.
- 2) During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship has become increasingly:
 - a) concerned with cultural issues, such as language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) ones and
 - b) individualist rather than collectivist.
- 3) The shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to the shift in dominant theoretical perspectives informing feminist academic work.

- 4) Intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

In the process of examining these hypotheses I intended to achieve four aims, namely:

- 1) To identify and examine changes in the themes and guiding perspectives of feminist academic work in Britain and the USA.
- 2) To identify and examine material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 3) To consider whether intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs in Britain and the USA.
- 4) To demonstrate that Mannheim's methodological approach is still relevant for guiding studies in the sociology of knowledge today.

In Chapter One, I provided an overview of Mannheim's view of knowledge and objectivity and outlined his three-stage methodological approach. In Chapter Two, I outlined the methods I used during the project. In Chapters Three to Six, I examined the four hypotheses that were guiding the project and, in the process of doing so, attempted to achieve my aims by following Mannheim's three-stage methodological approach. For a mixture of practical and intellectual reasons, I admit that I have been led to take a series of shortcuts in the route that Mannheim appears to advocate during the course of my investigations. Thus, bearing this in mind, I will draw the study to a close with some reflections on my methods, findings and experiences of using Mannheim as my guide and suggest some directions for future research. To help order my thoughts I will address each of the three stages of analysis that I conducted in my study in turn. Throughout this chapter it should be borne in mind that, according to Mannheim,

[t]he principle thesis of the sociology of knowledge is that there are modes of thought which cannot be adequately understood as long as their social origins are obscured.
(1968:2)

However, before one can examine these origins, attention must be paid to establishing the characteristics of the thought that one wishes to understand through sociological investigation.

7.2: Stage One - The First Stage of Immanent Analysis:

Identifying Perspectives as Ideal Types

...the ideal types...are indispensable hypotheses for research
(Mannheim, 1968:277)

Marking the first stage of analysis for studies in the sociology of knowledge, Mannheim suggests that it is necessary to outline the characteristics of *Weltanschauungen* or perspectives in order to establish ideal types. This first stage formed the main focus for Chapter Three. In a manner that seems to suggest one starts out with a blank slate, the method that Mannheim advocates for this stage involves, "tracing single expressions and records of thought which appear to be related back to a central *Weltanschauung*, which they express" (1968:276). The purpose of doing so is to reconstruct the internal characteristics of the perspectives that will form the ideal types. However, the method that I used for this first stage of analysis marked a shortcut that I decided and would still argue was necessary to take given the constraints of time and the fact that many texts addressing different perspectives within academic feminism were already available. Here, without claiming to have exhausted all possibilities and paying particular attention to the two perspectives in my first hypothesis, I mapped out a series of perspectives. I emphasised that these perspectives were internally heterogeneous and, in many ways, overlapping as well as often being philosophically at odds with one another. In addition, despite their heterogeneity, I suggested how these multiple perspectives might be linked back to a broader, more general *Weltanschauung* of feminism that demarcates them from other, non-feminist *Weltanschauungen*.

Mannheim in no way expects these ideal types to manifest themselves in a pure form in concrete historical situations. They are intended to aid the tracking, "of the course and direction of development which has actually taken place" (1968:277) and the identification and untangling of 'mixed types'. During the course of my second stage analysis the internal heterogeneity between and within individual texts in the sample was clearly evident. Moreover, in line with arguments that suggest the time has come to abandon taxonomy building projects, compared to the 1980 sample groups, where even here internal heterogeneity was evident, it was clear that it was much more difficult to attach a specific, albeit internally heterogeneous, label to individual texts in the 1998 groups.

I agree that it is desirable to avoid permanently branding individuals as advocates of specific static perspectives. Nevertheless, I still believe that the construction of ideal type perspectives is not only necessary as a first step to provide a springboard for analysing intellectual shifts within studies in the sociology of knowledge but also that taxonomies are necessary if we are to attempt to understand feminist theories *per se*. How can we distinguish between specific works and evaluate their political effectiveness as analyses of women's oppression and guides for social change in specific historical settings if we do not have categories that allow us to identify their philosophical underpinnings and orientation? Here, Mannheim is useful because he urges us to remember that the categories we use are ideal types.

Mannheim's view of knowledge also helps us to recognise that it cannot be assumed that all participants will have a history of using the same labels as each other to demarcate different forms of feminism when they enter a discussion. In addition, even if a number of people use the same labels to demarcate different forms of feminism, it can not be assumed that they have all attributed identical meanings to them - the apparent confusion about the meaning of the term materialist feminism that I highlighted in Chapter Three serves as but one example of this. Therefore, it is for these reasons that the processes involved in the first stage of analysis seem to be necessary first steps not only in studies in the sociology of knowledge but also in any discussion. In other words, before debating

an issue the meanings of the categories that will be used during the debate need to be made as explicit as possible. Here, Mannheim's view of objectivity is useful because it appears to suggest certain characteristics that participants should try to take account of when striving to reach agreement about the meanings of the categories that they will use when they begin their discussion. The key characteristics that I suggested were apparent within this view are: critical self-awareness, sensitivity to heterogeneity (in the choice of subject matter), a desire for comprehensiveness (in terms of taking account of different views about the subject matter chosen) and an appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge. The final characteristic is important because it urges participants to realise that the categories constructed at the outset are only ideal types. As such, they are intended to help open up a discussion rather than close it down.

Guided by Mannheim, within this stage of my study, I demonstrated critical self-awareness by explicitly stating the reasons why I was conducting the stage itself. My sensitivity to heterogeneity was apparent because I described a number of categories that had been used to demarcate different types of feminism and acknowledged that the categories I used were not intended to be viewed as exhaustive. In addition, I demonstrated my desire for comprehensiveness by taking account of the views in a number of existing texts. Finally, I demonstrated my appreciation of the dynamic nature of historical knowledge by emphasising that the categories I described were ideal types that had been constructed to help me reflect on the changing nature of feminist perspectives over time.

7.3: Stage Two - The Second Stage of Immanent Analysis:

Identifying Intellectual Shifts

Every author of the time accessible to us must be examined...and the imputation in each case must be made on the case of the blends and crossings of points of view which are to be found in his [sic] assertions.

The consistent carrying out of this task of imputation will finally produce the concrete picture of the course and direction of development which has actually taken place. It will reveal the actual history of these...styles of thought.

(Mannheim, 1968:277)

The second stage of Mannheim's methodological approach injects a temporal element into the study and involves examining intellectual work that was produced at a particular point in history. During the second stage the work under investigation is measured against the ideal types that were developed during the first stage. In my study, the second stage of analysis formed the focus for Chapters Four and Five. Hypotheses One, Two and Three provided the framework for this stage of the study. These three hypotheses are related to the first aim of the project. As a result of my investigations, I suggested that some trends in the expected direction were evident in the sample groups. However, I concluded that these trends were not strong enough to confirm the specific shifts in dominance that had been predicted by Hypotheses One and Two. Nevertheless, I did suggest that the findings confirmed Hypothesis Three. I will begin this section by highlighting some of the limitations that the nature of the sample itself may have placed upon my analysis during the second stage of Mannheim's approach. Next, I will reflect on the analysis that I conducted to reach my findings. Finally, I will suggest how my starting hypotheses for the second stage of analysis could be refined and extended in light of my findings for future research.

During the second stage of analysis; I was forced to take a shortcut in Mannheim's methodological approach for practical reasons. Thus, contrary to what Mannheim appears to suggest, I agreed with Ringer who states,

...we cannot possibly study an intellectual field in its entirety, and almost any considered tactic of selection is better than no tactic at all.

(1990:276)

Consequently, my investigations focused on a sample of texts that had been published in 1980 and 1998. In Chapter Two, I described how the specific criteria that I used to prepare the sample had been set in a manner that took account of Mannheim's view of objectivity. Nevertheless, in terms of continuity, I admit that the sample selected for the two years could be regarded as problematic because, with no more than one exception,¹ the authors and book editors of the texts in the 1980 and 1998 sample groups were

¹ Lynda Birke was one of the editors of a joint edited book in the 1980 British sample and also one of the authors of a joint authored journal article in the 1998 British sample.

different. Had the books been excluded and the level of analysis placed firmly on the changing nature of the journals over time this possible problem might have been eliminated. However, as I stated in Chapter Two, I deliberately wanted to include a broad range of texts and demonstrate some sensitivity to heterogeneity in terms of different publishing formats.

The fact that I diverted from Mannheim's suggestions by not tracking intellectual shifts between 1980 and 1998 might be viewed as more problematic than my use of a sample. Mannheim points out that different perspectives, "mutually affect and enrich one another" (1952a:41) rather than develop in isolation from one another. However, by only focussing on work that was published in 1980 and 1998 I was not able to attempt to analyse the actual course and direction of immanent influences over time. For example, I was unable to gauge the extent to which poststructuralism's immanent influence might have been responsible for the shift that was most generally evident in the 1998 sample groups regardless of the philosophical underpinnings of specific texts, namely, the shift towards heightened attention to difference and agency. In addition, the lack of tracking between the years at the second stage posed problems for the third stage of analysis. Here, it was difficult to gauge the ways in which sociological factors in the changing political, economic and social contexts of the 1980s and 1990s may have influenced the texts. For example, to what extent was the attention to constraining contexts as well as to agency that was evident in many of the 1998 texts representative of the slight taming of the 1980s New Right politics that occurred in the early to mid 1990s?

In addition, it could be argued that by focusing on the two years 1980 and 1998 I have not actually addressed the claims that were set for interrogation by Hypotheses One and Two, the precise wording of which include the phrase, "during the 1980s and 1990s". Certainly, contrary to what was predicted, I did not believe that there was enough evidence to suggest historical materialist dominance in the 1980 texts. Yet, as I noted in Chapter Five, in terms of my findings for the second year my choice of 1998 could have been too late. Had I tracked between the years I might have found that poststructuralist perspectives

were dominant earlier in the 1990s but towards the end of that decade a slight turning back had begun.

When I initially embarked on the project it had been my intention to track between the years by sampling again at two or three points between 1980 and 1998. However, it was not possible to carry out this tracking within the constraints of time and space. Certainly, a smaller sample with a handful of authors might have made it possible to track the intellectual course taken by a few individuals. However, this research was driven by a mixture of personal, political and intellectual motivations that included my desires to attempt to read much more widely than I had been doing and reflect on the extent to which certain claims about intellectual shifts within academic feminism were generally apparent. Therefore, the use of a smaller sample with a handful of authors did not seem appropriate for this particular study. Nevertheless, the extent to which certain claims about intellectual shifts were generally apparent *within* the 1980s and 1990s still requires analysing. Thus, this gap points towards one direction for future research. Nevertheless, I believe that the question of how to manage a detailed analysis that intends to track between years in a manner that does include a broad selection of texts within each point in time along the way is a problematic one.

Another point that I will highlight about the sample itself relates to the question of its representativeness. In Chapter Two, I acknowledged that I could not claim that my sample of journals and books was representative of academic feminism *per se*. I deliberately selected interdisciplinary journals in order to attempt to include authors from a variety of disciplinary backgrounds. Yet, having not conducted detailed analysis of the authors' disciplinary backgrounds I have not given serious consideration to the extent to which these journals are actually inter- or multidisciplinary. Regarding this point, in the USA context in the mid-1980s, Stacey and Thorne (1985) remarked on the underrepresentation of sociological work in *Feminist Studies* and *Signs*. On a related theme, one might, for example, question the extent to which the type of work by a sociologist that is published

within an interdisciplinary journal, such as *Signs*, bears similarities to that which would be published in a feminist sociology journal, such as *Gender & Society*.

In addition, because the greatest proportion of my texts were published within the journals and some of the journals included 'special issues' in both years, it is possible that the type of work selected for these particular publications could have skewed my findings. Certainly, the focus of the *Signs* 1980 double special issue on *Sex and Sexuality* was reasonably visible within a number of other texts in the USA sample outside of this journal. In as much as they addressed questions relating to 'race' and identity, the sample texts from the special issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* in *Women's Studies International Forum*, which all formed part of the British 1998 sample, appeared to share similarities to other texts in the British 1998 sample. Moreover, the approaches that were evident in the *Signs* 1998 special issue on *Feminisms and Youth Culture* were not absent in other texts in the USA sample for that year. Likewise, the 1980 sample as a whole included texts addressing similar issues to those in the special issues in *Women's Studies International Quarterly* on *Women and Media* and *The Voices and Words of Women and Men*. Nevertheless, it is possible that the volume of work devoted to certain themes due to the presence of special issues may have skewed the findings I reached. Indeed, the very presence of 'special issues' raises questions about how their themes are selected - a third stage question, which, along with the more general question of how any text is selected for publication, I have not addressed in this study.

In Chapter One, the role of publishers was one of the factors that I noted as having been highlighted as being important to consider during the third stage of analysis. However, investigation of this specific factor was beyond the boundaries that I set for the third stage in this project. Yet, because such a large proportion of the texts in the sample were taken from four journals it is important to highlight here how my findings for the second stage of analysis may have been skewed by these journals' particular editorial, academic and political missions. In Chapter Two, I described the criteria set for selecting the journals. Using these criteria, my choice of journals for the British sample was restricted to the two

journals I used. Although there was at least one other journal that I could have selected for the USA sample, practical reasons led me to reject it. From my findings it was evident that there were striking differences between the types of feminist work that was published in the journals in the 1980 sample. Some of these differences were still apparent in the 1998 sample, although the decline in the proportion of texts that demonstrated evidence of being influenced by historical materialism in *Feminist Review* was particularly noticeable, despite the relatively low number of texts in the British 1998 sample from this journal.

In the British context, *Feminist Review* and *Women's Studies International Quarterly* emerged in the late 1970s as tensions between radical and socialist feminists within the Women's Liberation Movement were strengthening. While members of the *Feminist Review* collective were exclusively Marxist in orientation, the editors of *Women's Studies International Quarterly* were not (Leonard, 1980b). Therefore, the theoretical differences that I identified between the two journals in the British 1980 sample are not surprising. In addition, the editors of *Feminist Studies* decided to associate the journal with the annual Berkshire Conferences on the History of Women in the 1970s. This decision appears to have influenced not only the broadly socialist orientation of *Feminist Studies* that was highly visible in the 1980 USA sample and still reasonably evident in 1998 but also a disciplinary bias towards history within this interdisciplinary journal (McDermott, 1994). In contrast, when *Signs* was set up in the mid-1970s, the editor-in-chief,

refused to affiliate...with the political agendas of any specific faction of the women's movement...[her] strategy was to achieve legitimacy, and with it institutional power for the political programs of women's studies, by producing a journal of impeccable academic quality under the auspices of one of America's most distinguished university presses.

(McDermott, 1994:98).

This observation may not help to account for the specific political leanings of the authors in *Signs*. Yet these insights might help to account for the relatively large number of reports on feminist research and articles tracking intellectual developments within specific academic disciplines that were evident in the 1980 issues of this journal.

Insights into the influence of the editors of *Signs* and *Feminist Studies* and the external constraints upon them can be gained from McDermott's (1994) comparative study of interdisciplinary feminist journals in the USA. This study traces the particular histories of these journals along with that of *Frontiers* from their emergence in the 1970s up to the early 1990s. However, apart from the brief insights into the background of the establishment of *Feminist Review* and *Women's Studies International Quarterly* provided by Leonard (1980b), it appears that the particular histories of these journals remain to be written.

The final point that I will mention about how the nature of the sample may have skewed the findings relates to the level at which my sampling was pitched, namely, a purposive sample that included four interdisciplinary feminist scholarly journals and a random sample of books. In order to illuminate how this might have skewed the findings, I will contrast my study with a recent one by Hemmings (2005). Just as I do, Hemmings (2005) takes claims about the dominance of poststructuralist perspectives in academic feminism in the 1990s within debates about feminist theory as her starting point. Hemmings' (2005) study is a particularly interesting one to use as a comparison because it is a classic example of how different people approach the same object differently. Consequently, it is worth exploring the background to and content of Hemmings' (2005) study in some depth.

Just as I did, Hemmings 'cut her academic teeth' in Higher Education in the 1990s. Yet, my academic teeth were not cut as exclusively or positively on poststructuralism as hers appear to have been (Hemmings, 2005:122). These factors are most probably due to the particular mixings of our differing disciplinary backgrounds and institutional locations when we embarked on our studies and the experiences that we brought with us that had influenced our views of the world. Therefore, unlike Hemmings, I do not draw positive inspiration from Michel Foucault (2005:199) or particular key feminist theorists of the 1990s (Judith Butler, Donna Haraway, Gayatri Spivak). Indeed, my frustration with my obsession with one of these key feminist theorists - Judith Butler - provided one of the primary motivations for embarking on a study that sought to examine work that was not

solely produced by academics who were treated as 1990s feminist 'stars' in debates about feminist theory.

In addition, I do not see what Hemmings regards as the, "challenge to the interdisciplinary eclecticism associated with poststructuralism, and of course feminist approaches" (Hemmings, 2005:130) that has recently been made by feminist academics as a simple, "call for disciplinary specificity, training and rigour" (2005:130). In the USA context, the articles in the special issue, *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies*, in *Feminist Studies*, which formed part of the sample for this project, demonstrate that these 'challenges' have been linked to critical reflections on the extent to which the concept of interdisciplinarity has been and is possible to implement in practice. Focussing specifically on the development of PhD programmes, the debates in this special issue also relate to the desirability of attempting to develop thoroughly interdisciplinary programmes given the realities of the academic job market for future feminist academics. Here it is recognised that full time positions in Women's Studies departments are limited and subject areas outside of Women's Studies are still largely organised along traditional disciplinary lines. In the British context, the setting of stricter guidelines for postgraduate training at a national level since the mid-1990s is another factor that might appear to limit the extent to which graduate level programmes can be interdisciplinary in nature. These guidelines have to be adhered to if academics want research council recognition for their graduate level programmes. This recognition not only adds to the prestige of a particular programme but also allows potential students to compete for funding for their studies. Within the more specific context of feminist theory, the challenges to interdisciplinarity represent more of a questioning of the ways that claims to interdisciplinarity mystify disciplinary hierarchies (Stacey, 1997:56). Like Hemmings, I am aware of critics from the social sciences who complain that too much of what gets to count as feminist theory in the 1990s and 2000s is that which literature specialists and philosophers produce. However, contrary to what Hemmings' (2005:130) arguments might seem to imply, I have yet to find a feminist literary critic who complains that the type of work that gets to count as representative of feminist theory in the 1990s and 2000s is too sociological.

Using a phrase that I believe has a distinctively Foucauldian flavour, Hemmings says that she is, "interested in the technology of Western feminist story telling - its form, its function and effects" (2005:117). During her examination of recent stories about academic feminism's recent theoretical past she seeks to question, "What, rhetorical, exclusionary, inclusive or diversionary tactics are employed to secure this story and not that one, this present and past and not those ones?" (Hemmings, 2005:119). Hemmings is not interested in seeking to consider what might have actually been going on within academic feminism in general in the 1970s, 1980s or 1990s. She believes that this type of study would represent, "an act of disavowed epistemic violence" (Hemmings, 2005:118) because it would mark an attempt to 'get the story straight' and, in so doing, mystify the exclusions that would inevitably enter it along the way. Ironically, she nevertheless appears to admit that the purpose of her examination is to allow her to reflect on how she can begin to tell a more accurate story than those that are currently being told (Hemmings, 2005:118, 130).

Focusing on a selection of excerpts from recent interdisciplinary feminist and cultural theory journals, Hemmings (2005) demonstrates that three tactics are used to secure the story of poststructuralism's dominance in 1990s feminism. First, poststructuralist dominance is secured by making large generalisations about the state of academic feminism in the 1970s where references to individual theorists of that period are absent. The specific generalisation she highlights here is that 1970s feminism is characterised as being essentialist. This generalisation is used to contrast with the non-essentialist difference-sensitive views of 1990s feminism. Secondly, rather than making large generalisations without any citations, generalisations about 1990s feminism are secured by making reference to no more than a few feminist theorists - most usually, Judith Butler and/or Donna Haraway and/or Gayatri Spivak. Thirdly, the dominance of poststructuralism is secured within the work of these particular 1990s theorists through selective citations of their intellectual influences - most often, Foucault and/or Derrida and/or Lacan. Thus, Hemmings (2005) shows how the poststructuralist orientation of these particular 1990s theorists is secured by excluding the (female) feminists and non-poststructuralist theorists

(who may or may not be female feminists) who have influenced the development of their work.

As I noted above, Hemmings is not interested in trying to address what might have actually been going on in the 1970s. Instead, she makes some 'gestures' as to how we might begin to find out about the complexity of 1970s feminism for ourselves, which include a few references to individual 1970s texts and suggesting a visit to the Women's Library in London. In addition, Hemmings does not appear to be interested in trying to find out what might have been generally going on in academic feminism in the 1990s. Instead, marking what she regards as, "a starting point, in what will inevitably be a longer set of reflections" (Hemmings, 2005:130), she questions the way the work of a few 1990s 'star' feminists is portrayed within stories of academic feminism's recent past. Therefore, rather than looking beyond the work that has been produced by a few key feminists, she urges us to look more closely at their work so that we can uncover the theoretical eclecticism that actually exists within their approaches. Here, she offers two possible pathways for future research. First, she suggests that we should compare and contrast more fully key thinkers who, despite being associated with poststructuralism, are often linked to different frameworks. She advocates this type of approach to enable us to reflect more deeply on their similarities as well as their differences. Secondly, rather than simply stressing the male influences on these key thinkers' work - specifically, Foucault, Lacan and Derrida - we should focus on their female, feminist influences to demonstrate that they are not solely influenced by poststructuralism or men.

I find the example Hemmings uses to illuminate her second suggestion - Judith Butler's work - particularly irritating. Like Hemmings, I would want to be among those who emphasise that Butler draws on multiple theorists during the development of her theory of performative gender rather than just Foucault and Lacan. I would also admit that the multiple theorists that Butler draws on speak from diverse philosophical positions. In addition, I would agree that Butler grants quite a lot of space to discussing Monique Wittig's work in *Gender Trouble* (1990). Nevertheless, unlike Hemmings (2005:131), I

believe it is a distortion of Butler's work to suggest that she was interested in the historical materialist method that Wittig had appropriated from Marx. Certainly, Butler used Wittig's work (along with that by other women such as de Beauvoir, Irigaray and Kristeva) to try to inject feminist insights into Foucault and Lacan's work. This need was highlighted at the end of her first book, *Subjects of Desire: Hegelian Reflection in Twentieth Century France* (1987) where she considered ideas about subject formation within 20th Century French (male) philosophy that draw on and extend Hegel's treatment of desire. Although Butler (1990) includes a reflection on Wittig's work as part of her project of injecting feminist insights into Foucault and Lacan's work, their view of the subject and language was already influencing her. Consequently, rather than being interested in the historical materialist method that Wittig, along with other French (non-Marxist historical) materialist feminists, appropriated from Marx, she severs Wittig from her historical materialist philosophical underpinnings because she reads Wittig through a poststructuralist lens. As Jackson points out,

[Butler] does not read Wittig in the context of the thinkers whom Wittig herself (1992, p. xiv) names as her chief political influences, such as Mathieu, Delphy and Guillaumin, but in conjunction with Foucault, Lacan, Derrida, Kristeva and Irigaray.
(1995:17).

While the theorists Butler draws on may be multiple and eclectic, they are read through the singular lens granted by a poststructuralist view of language. Therefore, she either provides distorted readings of theorists who do not speak from a poststructuralist perspective or deliberately modifies their work to fit a poststructuralist framework. As Mannheim (1952f) reminds us, when looking at the perspectives that influence a thinker it is important to take note of the 'documentary' meaning as well as the 'expressive' meaning. As I mentioned in Chapter Two, it is not enough to simply address the perspectives that are explicitly referenced in a text. In addition, the amount of space granted to discussing individual thinkers or labels does not automatically serve as an indicator of the relative importance of the perspectives associated with them to the author who is discussing them. Instead, it is important to also consider the perspectives that emerge from the text as a whole - the 'documentary' meaning - and influence the way that

specific theorists are discussed within it. Merely focusing on the eclecticism of Butler's work that is visible at the level of 'expressive' meaning distorts the singularity that I believe is visible at the level of 'documentary' meaning. This singularity is Butler's poststructuralist view of language.

In her conclusion, Hemmings (2005:131) reveals that she likes Judith Butler as well as Rosi Braidotti because of the enjoyment she gets from reading their work. Yet, I believe that the quality of a theory should be evaluated on its utility as a practical tool to aid understanding of a particular problem and to guide action that seeks to solve that problem. The question of whether a theory provides intellectual entertainment for the highly educated should not really enter the equation. Only time will tell if Hemmings (2005) will turn her attention away from the work of a few key theorists in her quest to tell a more accurate story of academic feminism's recent past. How she might achieve this or know if the story she comes to tell is more accurate than existing ones without attempting to obtain some idea of what might have generally been going on in academic feminism puzzles me.

I believe it, "is an act of disavowed epistemic violence" (Hemmings, 2005:118) to not attempt to question the extent to which exclusions might be created by studies that either make generalisations without substantive evidence or base large generalisations on the work of a handful of key feminists. Recognising the exclusionary nature of recent feminist theoretical debates Maynard argues, "that a debate needs to be opened up in feminism as to what is to be understood by the term theory" (1995:276). Thus, having been influenced by Maynard's (1995) arguments, I did not want to restrict my definition of theory to a narrow range of key thinkers who are often used to define it within debates about the general theoretical state of feminism. All studies are guided by theory (Chalmers, 1982 ch.3) and if the people conducting them are feminists then, in my view, the theories that are influencing their work should be taken into account during debates about the general theoretical state of academic feminism.

Therefore, a main purpose of using two perspectives as ideal types in Hypothesis One was to attempt to gain some insights into what actually was generally going on in academic feminism in 1980 and 1998. These ideal types served as tools to help me reflect on the ways that the internal characteristics of the texts in my sample conformed to or diverted from the perspectives they described. As Mannheim points out, "[t]he consistent carrying out of this task of imputation will finally produce the concrete picture of the course and direction of development which has actually taken place" (1968:277). By taking a purposive and random sample I aimed to include a reasonably broad selection of texts. I have not claimed that my sample was representative and I have certainly not suggested that I have managed to 'get the story straight' in this project. On the contrary, I have emphasised the limitations of my study at various points in the thesis.

During the second stage of analysis the messiness of the reality of the texts was clearly evident. Nevertheless, I did find intellectual trends in the expected direction. However, these were not strong enough to count as dominant. Consequently, it seems reasonable to suggest that the theoretical perspectives that are perceived to be dominant in recent debates about feminist theory might be more a reflection of 'fashion trends' that are associated with the work of a few key theorists than of the work that academic feminists generally produce. Yet, my findings have provided some insights that can be used to refine my starting hypotheses for use as ideal types in future research that aims to continue to reflect on what might have been generally going on in academic feminism in Britain and the USA. These refinements will be addressed at the end of this section.

Turning to focus more specifically on the analysis that I conducted during the second stage, it is important to highlight that the findings I reached were based upon *my* reading and interpretation of the texts. Certainly, the ideal types from the first stage of analysis and my definitions of the terms material and cultural issues and individualist and collectivist outlook did give me tools against which to measure my reading and interpretation of individual texts. In addition, Mannheim's view of objectivity had sensitised me to the need for ongoing critical self-awareness. Consequently, I was conscious of the

need to critically reflect on how my interpretations might be influenced by what was expected to be found as predicted by the hypotheses and also by what I actually hoped to find, based on my own 'preferences'. Although I followed the three stages of analysis in the order that Mannheim suggests, it is important to point out that I already had some knowledge about the broader material and cultural contexts that were to form the focus for the third stage from previous study and experience. Thus, the ways in which the second stage analysis might be influenced by my desire to 'fit' the findings from the second stage with those from the third stage was another important factor that I reflected on as I read the texts.

However, Mannheim's view of objectivity highlights the need for comprehensiveness, in terms of taking the views of others about the same 'object' under consideration into account, when reaching decisions about results. In Chapter Two, I mentioned that, by its very nature, this study involved one researcher. Nevertheless, I highlighted how I had been able to take the views of others into account when conducting the research. Yet, although I had discussed the results from the second stage with others during the course of project, I had not been in a position to compare my results from the texts with anyone who had read the texts in my sample for the same purposes as I had. If I had been working as part of a team of researchers, texts could have been swapped to double check the findings, thereby, adding weight to their reliability. Therefore, this seems to highlight some of the potential benefits of collaborative research that are not available to the lone researcher.

Clearly, my analysis during the second stage has limitations. Despite these limitations I found certain trends that were in line with what was predicted by Hypotheses One and Two even if they were not strong enough to confirm the shifts in dominance that were predicted. The key findings were summarised at the end of Chapters Four and Five and appear in Appendix IX. In addition, during my final summary in Chapter Five, I argued that the findings confirmed Hypothesis Three because the content of the texts, in terms of their

particular foci and outlook, appeared to be related to the theoretical perspectives informing them.

I used the hypotheses in this study to provide a clear framework that focussed my attention on specific areas of feminist scholarship. The areas that I focussed on were the theoretical perspectives informing academic feminism and two aspects of its content, namely, types of issues addressed and outlook. The hypotheses were used to help open up an exploration within the framework set rather than close it down because they were treated as ideal types. Consequently, they served as a measure against which to gauge individual expressions of thought during the second stage. Thus, what is important in studies in the sociology of knowledge is the pattern that actually arises when one considers the ways in which the texts conform to and/or diverge from the ideal types.

In the Introduction, I demonstrated how I had derived Hypotheses One and Two from my reading of and reflection on specific arguments that were made in recent debates about feminist scholarship. These readings and reflections were influenced by the concern that I had about claims that suggested academic feminism had become increasingly depoliticised and elitist. Therefore, the shift towards poststructuralist dominance and the particular trends that certain authors associated with it that I chose to focus on were important to me. Consequently, this partly explains why I used the specific ideal types that appeared in Hypotheses One and Two. In addition, because of the apparent confusion surrounding the term materialist, which seemed to be a term that was often used to denote the types of perspectives declining in dominance in Hypothesis One, I added the term 'historical' to it. I outlined the reasons why I reached this decision in the Introduction. I admit that I gain a sense of relief from not having confirmed the results that were predicted for 1998. However, given that I did find certain patterns in the texts these can now be used to refine my hypotheses for future research. To this end, I will propose a

series of hypotheses that I have derived from the key findings that emerged during my exploration of Hypotheses One, Two and Three.²

- 1) In 1980 historical materialist perspectives were highly visible in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.
- 2) Compared to historical materialist perspectives, the influence of poststructuralist perspectives was negligible in academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980.
- 3) Although not the only perspectives in circulation, two internally heterogeneous key perspectives were visible in feminist scholarship in Britain and the USA in 1980: broadly, socialist feminism - attending to the systems of capitalism and patriarchy - and radical feminism - focussing more attention directly on the system of patriarchy.
- 4) By the late 1990s historical materialist perspectives were still influencing a relatively large proportion of feminist academics in a positive way in Britain and the USA.
- 5) Between 1980 and the late 1990s historical materialist perspectives within academic feminism in Britain and the USA had become more historical and dialectical and the structures they addressed had multiplied.
- 6) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the influence of poststructuralist perspectives in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.
- 7) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the influence of internally, philosophically heterogeneous perspectives that can be broadly labelled Black or multiracial feminism.
- 8) Overall, a reasonably even mixture of material (i.e. social and economic) and cultural (i.e. language, representation, symbolisation and discourse) issues were addressed by academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980 and in 1998.
- 9) The particular emphasis placed on material and/or cultural issues by an academic feminist is related to the theoretical perspective or specific mixing of perspectives that influence her in a positive way.
- 10) In 1980 the dominant outlook of academic feminism in Britain and the USA was collectivist - on the whole, women tended to be addressed as members of a relatively

² The revised series of hypotheses for future second stage analysis also appear in Appendix X.

homogenous group who were oppressed by relatively static and internally undifferentiated systems that were assumed to have relatively homogenous negative effects on women.

11) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the concern with:

- a) multiple differences among women,
- b) the multiple identities of individual women and
- c) women's agency

in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.

12) By the late 1990s the dominant outlook in academic feminism in Britain and the USA was one that attempted to address the tensions between a collectivist outlook and an individualist outlook by attending to multiple differences and women's agency within structures or systems that shape women and that women shape.

13) The extent to which the work of an academic feminist exhibits a collectivist outlook, an individualist outlook or one that stresses the tensions between a collectivist and individualist outlook is related to the theoretical perspective or specific mixing of perspectives that influence her in a positive way.

7.4: Stage Three -

Sociological Analysis

Although it would be indefensible to construe ideologies merely from the situation of their authors and to ignore the wider stage on which they perform, neither will the larger frame of tension in itself explain how the spokesmen [sic] of certain views happen to make their choices and to join particular groups.

(Mannheim, 1956:122)

The third stage of Mannheim's methodological approach marks the stage where, "[t]he sociological task proper...begins" (Mannheim, 1952a:189). During the third stage, the findings from the second stage of analysis are considered in relation to other social factors. This final stage of analysis is intended to enhance understanding of the findings from the second stage. The third stage of analysis formed the focus for Chapter Six. In

this chapter, I addressed the fourth hypothesis and, as a consequence, the second and third aims of the project.

When preparing to embark on the third stage I had to think quite deeply about what the fourth hypothesis was actually asking me to investigate. Given the constraints of space and time on the study, the problem I faced was how to attempt to address the claim that was entailed within Hypothesis Four in a manner that was generally relevant to the sample as a whole. Although I had not confirmed Hypothesis One, there had certainly been a significant rise in poststructuralist perspectives in the 1998 sample groups. Nevertheless, two intellectual shifts had appeared to be more generally visible throughout the sample than the rise of poststructuralism. Consequently, I decided to focus attention on these two shifts - greater attention to diversity and women's agency - in an attempt to remain sensitive to my findings from the sample as a whole. In Chapter Six, I mentioned that these two intellectual shifts were not surprising in light of existing literature. In addition, I emphasised that my focus marked no more than a starting point for analysis at the third stage. The conclusions I drew from the analysis that I carried out during the third stage appeared to confirm the final hypothesis. Namely, the intellectual shifts that I set out to examine in Chapter Six appeared to be related to shifts in the broader material and cultural contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

In terms of my findings from the second stage of analysis, poststructuralism's increased visibility and its apparent rise to dominance in debates about feminist theory in the 1990s within the broader contexts that I mapped out during the third stage is a relevant story that remains to be explored. It seems reasonable to suggest that the emergence of poststructuralism could be among the factors that prompted a more general shift towards diversity and women's agency. However, having not tracked instances of immanent influence between 1980 and 1998 I did not believe that I had evidence to justify telling a story about the broad shifts in the sample that simply centred on the rise of poststructuralism.

For reasons outlined in Chapter Two, the conclusions that I reached during the third stage of analysis were primarily drawn from my reading of and reflection on existing literature. This literature was used to help me pitch my investigation at a very general level in terms of the material and cultural contexts. Because of the focus of the study and criteria set when selecting the sample texts, it seemed appropriate to make the emergence of and developments within the Women's Liberation Movement during the 1960s and 1970s a key part of these contexts. Yet the Movement appeared to have become increasingly fractured and visible collective activism seemed to have somewhat declined by the mid-1980s. Therefore, having lost its main guiding thread, my investigation of factors that might enhance understanding of the two key trends that were generally evident in the 1998 texts became much more tentative in its approach. I explicitly stated that I was in no way claiming to have exhausted all possible factors that might help to enhance understanding of the intellectual shifts that formed the focus for Chapter Six. Yet, because of time and space constraints, I am acutely aware that throughout the third stage I was inevitably drawn towards seeking out factors that appeared to confirm the hypothesis.

It should be remembered that I was guided by Mannheim's views about the principle thesis of the sociology of knowledge, namely, "there are modes of thought which cannot be adequately understood as long as their social origins are obscured" (1968:2). Therefore, I believe the approach that I took is defensible. Nevertheless, I realise that this approach leaves me open to charges that claim I have not actually attempted to critically reflect on Hypothesis Four. Yet the extent to which these charges might be justifiable along with the extent to which the specific factors I examined might actually account for trends in individual texts are questions that I will leave open for others to debate.

Practical reasons led me to pitch my investigation at a very general level during the third stage. Yet, in so doing, I had taken another shortcut in the route that Mannheim advocates. As I mentioned in Chapters Two and Six, Mannheim appears to suggest that there are two phases to the third stage but I have only attempted to address one, namely, "the wider stage". The second phase would entail identifying and comparing the social

locations of individual authors and book editors within the sample. Analysis at this level would allow for detailed consideration of whether these locations enhance understanding of why certain texts appeared to be influenced by some perspectives while other texts seemed to be more influenced by different perspectives. Thus, the absence of the second phase from this particular project but its apparent necessity for deepening understanding of the connections between social existence and thought points towards an avenue for future research that I will address below.

The need for the second phase of analysis within the "wider stage" appears to be related to Mannheim's understanding of the individual. This understanding provides a sociological explanation of why people who live within the same historical context do not all think alike. Because of the relevance of this view to contemporary debates about the concepts of sameness and difference, I believe it is worth emphasising it here as it demonstrates Mannheim's sensitivity to heterogeneity. Thus, Mannheim states,

[w]e contend with the realists that the behaviour of the individual cannot be understood apart from his [*sic*] social relations...We accept the aim of the nominalists to comprehend the behaviour and motivations of the person, but we oppose their tendency to construe the individual as a socially detached and residual entity. We believe that the individual as such can be understood only through his [*sic*] participation in a multitude of groupings some of which are coordinated while others overlap or even conflict. What makes a single being sociologically relevant is not his [*sic*] comparative detachment from society, but his [*sic*] multiple involvement. The process of individuation takes place in the very process in which the person becomes identified with overlapping and conflicting groups.

(1956:110)

Mannheim also suggests a number of factors that appear to be among the most important to investigate when attempting to understand the thought of particular intellectuals. These factors were mentioned in Chapter One but they are worth restating here:

...the social background of the individual; the particular phase of his [*sic*] career curve - whether he [*sic*] is on the upgrade, at a plateau, or on the downgrade; whether he [*sic*] moves up individually or as a member of a group; whether he [*sic*] is blocked in his advancement or thrown back on his [*sic*] initial situation; the phase of a social movement in which he [*sic*] participates - the initial, middle, or the terminal shape; the position of his [*sic*] generation in relation to other generations; his [*sic*] social habitat; and, finally, the type of aggregation in which he [*sic*] performs.

(Mannheim, 1956:158)

As I noted above, my examination of the "wider stage" during this project did include a consideration of the social movement that the authors and book editors are associated

with. Admittedly, this examination did not take account of the specific relationships individual authors might have had to the Women's Liberation Movement. Yet it is clear that I would not have been able to manage a detailed second phase analysis that addressed all of the factors that Mannheim suggests given the size of my sample. However, as I will describe below, I believe that there are some ways in which my omissions could be addressed in future research.

Although Mannheim appears to have relied most heavily on qualitative methods in his own work on the sociology of knowledge, I mentioned in Chapter One that he seems to advocate the use of a mixed methods approach during the third stage. This approach involves analysing statistical data relating to the social background of the group of intellectuals in question alongside, "analyses of individual life histories" (Mannheim, 1956:123). However, I believe that it would be difficult to locate or gather reliable statistical information about the social backgrounds of feminist academics within the periods under consideration in my study for at least two reasons. First, in Chapter Two, I pointed out that my definition of academic feminism does not restrict its boundaries to academe. Secondly, although I used figures relating to Women's Studies programmes as an example of the growth of academic feminism within academe during Chapter Six, it certainly is not the case that all feminist academics who are based in higher education institutions are located within Women's Studies centres or departments. Bearing these points in mind, I have already noted that I made no claims to suggest my sample was representative. Yet one could use the sample texts to gather information about the authors and book editors in order to attempt to gain some awareness about their similarities and differences as a first step in future research.

Nevertheless, this approach would probably only provide enough data for analysis at the most general level of what might be regarded as 'professional background' because of the type of biographical information that is most usually provided within academic texts. With regard to the nature of the sample I drew, one could attempt to identify whether individuals were based in a higher education institution or not and what the authors'/ book editors'

disciplinary backgrounds were. Once compiled as statistical information it could be used to consider whether similarities and differences at this most general level have any relationships to the types of theoretical perspectives influencing texts within and across time.

Yet I have doubts about whether the results would be particularly easy to obtain or 'reliable' even at this most general level. In terms of the former, when reading the texts for this project I did note down information about the authors' and editors' 'professional backgrounds'. From my notes I am aware that biographical information at the most general levels noted above was available for almost all of the texts in the 1998 sample. However, the information was either absent from a reasonably large proportion of the 1980 texts or incomplete, particularly among the texts in the British sample. With regard to the latter, information about 'disciplinary background' is often restricted to departmental affiliation. However, the extent to which departmental affiliation reflects an individual's disciplinary background in terms of training and approach to academic work is questionable.³ Bearing these problems in mind, one could move on to sample from the sample in order to gather more in-depth biographical information about intellectual, political and personal backgrounds from interviews as a second step in future research. These interviews would provide data for the, "analyses of individual life histories" (Mannheim, 1956:123) that Mannheim advocates. This more detailed information could then be considered alongside the relevant texts to consider how it may enhance understanding of the intellectual influences within them.

The sample drawn for this study was deliberate. However, as a result of my decisions, it is clear that there are gaps in the route I have taken through the second and third stages. These gaps relate to the lack of intellectual tracking between the years as well as the lack of attention to the second phase of Mannheim's sociological analysis. Therefore, to

³ For example, one of the authors in the 1998 sample who was based in an English department is now based in a Sociology department. In addition, I am also aware that those whose 'background' is stated as 'Women's Studies' could also pose a problem, however, in the sample itself most authors who did have affiliations to Women's Studies centres or departments also had a 'traditional' discipline noted alongside.

address both of these gaps, I believe it might be more fruitful now to return to the second stage in order to focus on just a handful of authors rather than simply using my existing sample to try to continue to gather information at the third stage. Merely marking a starting point, this suggested direction would allow for the gathering of initial results from second and third stage analysis that could then form ideal types for future research.

Even when focussing on a handful of authors I believe it would be helpful to attempt to reduce some of the variables at the outset in order to make the study manageable. For example, one might select feminist academics from the same generation with reasonably similar disciplinary backgrounds who had been active within the Women's Liberation Movement during the late 1960s and 1970s and were still academically active in the 1990s but whose theoretical perspectives differed from each other. The smaller focus would allow one to track and compare the intellectual development of the feminist academics over the years and also provide the opportunity for considering their biographies in relation to their work. Here, for example, one might take account of their social networks as well as their career curve and political involvement. The differences between the authors' backgrounds that might arise within this type of study and appear to account for their differing perspectives could then be used as hypotheses for yet further research.

7.5: Concluding Remarks

When my study is broken down into parts it is possible to identify elements of interdisciplinarity within it. For example, the discipline of philosophy is evident within my interest in epistemology and Mannheim's view of objectivity. In addition, my analysis during the second stage of Mannheim's methodological approach bears marks of the influence of literary criticism and the concerns of the disciplines of history, human geography and politics can be detected within my analysis during the third stage of Mannheim's methodological approach. Nevertheless, when my project is taken as a

whole, I am happy to admit that I believe it has a disciplinary bias and that discipline is sociology. More specifically, my study falls within a particular field of sociology, namely, the sociology of knowledge. During the course of my exploration of academic feminism in Britain and the USA I have had one primary guide. Within the context of a feminist research project that began in 1998, I am not unduly concerned about the fact that my primary guide was a man who had not explicitly claimed to be a feminist academic and had died over fifty years before I commenced my study.

The factors that led me to embark on this project were multiple and included a mixture of personal, political and intellectual motivations. Due to the particular intellectual journey I had travelled along before embarking on the project many of those who had had a profound influence on my thinking had been feminists who were also women. Reading Mannheim through my prior understanding of the social shaping of knowledge, the multiplicity of social groups existing within historical contexts and the possibility of a notion of objectivity that acknowledges the social situatedness of all forms of knowledge led me to appreciate the views that he offered. In Chapter One, I demonstrated that his view of objectivity not only appears to anticipate but also seems more comprehensive than those offered by the particular feminist epistemologists who I had come to favour. Here I suggested how his view of objectivity straddles Sandra Harding's (1991, 1993) notion of Strong Objectivity and Helen Longino's (1990, 1993) notion of contextual empiricism. When reading Mannheim, I also realised that he appears to offer a methodological approach that would enable a systematic study of the sociology of knowledge. Thus, bearing all of these points in mind, Mannheim's work on the sociology of knowledge seemed to be particularly well suited for guiding this project.

Using Mannheim as my primary guide throughout this study has convinced me that the intuition I had about his work before I commenced my analysis of academic feminism was correct. Mannheim's methodological approach does provide a pathway that allows for a systematic study of the connections between ideas and social existence. Certainly, I have been forced to take shortcuts along the way in order to make my study manageable.

These shortcuts have been highlighted during my reflections in this Chapter. Nevertheless, I have suggested some of the ways in which my omissions seem to point towards pathways for future research. Just as Mannheim urges us to regard the perspectives that form the focus for the first stage of analysis, I would suggest that his methodological approach should be regarded as an ideal type that in reality will probably never fully manifest itself in a single study. Yet I do not believe that this detracts from its usefulness. What has struck me most during my reading of Mannheim and my experiences of using him as my guide is the relevance of his view of knowledge to contemporary debates both within and outside of academic feminism.

Appendix I: Britain 1980 Sample Texts

Feminist Review

- Caesar, Ann (1980) "Italian Feminism and the Novel: Sibilla Alermo's *A Woman*" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.79-87.
- Campbell, Beatrix (1980) "A Feminist Sexual Politics: now you see it now you don't" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.1-18.
- Cousins, Jean (1980) "Comment on EOC's Recommendation to Repeal Protective Laws Limiting Women's Hours of Work" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.12-14.
- Coward, Rosalind (1980) "'This Novel Changes Lives': Are Women's Novels Feminist Novels? A Response to Rebecca O'Rourke's 'Summer Reading'" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.53-64.
- Coyle, Angela (1980) "The Protection Racket" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.1-12.
- Himmelweit, Susan (1980) "Abortion: Individual Choice and Social Control" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.65-68.
- Kaluzynska, Eva (1980) "Wiping the Floor With Theory - A Survey of Writings on Housework" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.27-54.
- Land, Hilary (1980) "The Family Wage" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.55-77.
- Lovell, Alice (1980) "Fresh Horizons: The Aspirations and Problems of Intending Women Mature Students" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.93-104.
- Margolis, Karen (1980) "The Long and Winding Roads (Reflections on *Beyond the Fragments*)" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.89-102.
- Nava, Mica (1980) "Gender and Education: A Discussion of Two Recent Books" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.69-78.
- Phillips, Anne & Taylor, Barbara (1980) "Sex and Skill: Notes Towards a Feminist Economics" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.79-88.
- Phillips, Eileen (1980) "Letter From Eileen Phillips: More on *Beyond The Fragments*" *Feminist Review*, 6, pp.108-110.
- Stacey, Margaret & Price, Marion (1980) "Women and Power" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.33-52.
- Steedman, Carolyn (1980) "'The Tidy House'" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.1-24.
- Wilson, Elizabeth (1980a) "Beyond The Ghetto: Thoughts on *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* by Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal and Hilary Wainwright" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.28-44.
- Wolpe, Annmarie (1980) "Introduction to Fresh Horizons" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.89-92.
- Yuval-Davis, Nira (1980) "The Bearers of the Collective: Women and Religious Legislation in Israel" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.15-27.

Women's Studies International Quarterly

- Allen, Sheila (1980) "Perhaps a Seventh Person?" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.325-339.
- Baehr, Helen (1980) "The 'Liberated Woman' in Television Drama" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.29-40.
- Booth, Jane (1980) "Watching the Family" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.15-28.
- Bruner, Edward M. & Kelso, Jane P. (1980) "Gender Differences in Graffiti: A Semiotic Perspective" *Women's International Studies Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.239-252.
- Dalton, Pen (1980) "Feminist Art Practice and the Mass Media: A 'Personal' Account" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.55-58.
- Ettorre, Betsy (1980) "Sappho Revisited: A New Look at Lesbianism" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.415-428.
- Evans, Mary (1980a) "Views of Women and Men in the Work of Simone de Beauvoir" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.395-404.

- Freeman, Helen & Jones, Alison (1980) "For Women Only?" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.429-440.
- Gordon, Bette & Kay, Karyn (1980) "Report on Feminist Film Event: 1979 Feminism and Cinema Event Edinburgh International Film Festival" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.121-122.
- Karpf, Ann (1980) "Women and Radio" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.41-54.
- Leman, Joy (1980) "'The Advice of a Real Friend': Codes of Intimacy and Oppression in Women's Magazines 1937-1955" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.63-78.
- Litman, Gloria K. (1980) "Women, Alcohol and Cultural Stereotyping: Updating the Myth" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.347-355.
- Tammes, Diane (1980) "Camerawoman Obscura: A 'Personal' Account" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.59-62.
- Walters, Anna (1980) "When Women's Reputations are in Male Hands: Elizabeth Gaskell and the Critics" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.405-414.

Books

- Adams, Carol & Laurikietis, Rae (1980) *The Gender Trap: A Closer Look at Sex Roles, Book Three: Messages and Images (revised edition)* London: Virago.
- Birke, Lynda, Faulkner, Wendy, Best, Sandy, Janson-Smith, Deirdre & Overfield, Kathy (eds) (1980) *Alice Through the Microscope: The Power of Science over Women's Lives* London: Virago.
- Brittain, Vera (1980) *Testament of Experience: An Autobiographical Story of the Years 1925-1950* London: Virago.
- Fletcher, Sheila (1980) *Feminists and Bureaucrats: A Study in the Development of Girls' Education in the Nineteenth Century* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leonard, Diana (1980a) *Sex and Generation: A Study of Courtship and Weddings* London: Tavistock.
- Lowry, Suzanne (1980) *The Guilt Cage: Housewives and a Decade of Liberation* London: Elm Tree Books.
- Malos, Ellen (ed.) (1980) *The Politics of Housework* London: Allison & Busby.
- Paczuska, Anna (1980) *Sisters and Workers* London: Socialist Unlimited.
- Waddy, Charis (1980) *Women in Muslim History* London: Longman.
- Wilson, Elizabeth (1980b) *Only Halfway to Paradise: Women in Postwar Britain, 1945-1968* London: Tavistock.

Appendix II: USA 1980 Sample Texts

Women's Studies International Quarterly

- Anthony, Bobbie M. (1980) "Parallels, Particularities, Problems and Positive Possibilities Related to Institutional Sexism and Racism" *Women's International Studies Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.339-346.
- Blaubergs, Maija S. (1980) "An Analysis of Classic Arguments Against Changing Sexist Language" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.135-148.
- Eddings, Barbara M. (1980) "Women in Broadcasting: *De Jure De Facto*" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.1-14.
- Engle, Marianne (1980) "Family Influences on the Language Development of Young Children" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.259-266.
- Flora, Cornelia B. (1980) "Women in Latin American Fotonovelas: From Cinderella to Mata Hari" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.95-104.
- Glazer, Nona (1980) "Overworking the Working Woman: The Double Day in a Mass Magazine" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.79-94.
- Grief, Esther B. (1980) "Sex Differences in Parent-Child Conversations" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.253-258.
- Hoagland, Susan L. (1980) "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.285-294.
- Humphries, Jane (1980) "The Socio-Economic Determinants of Recourse to Legal Abortion" *Women's International Studies Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.377-394.
- Martyna, Wendy (1980a) "Teaching About Language and the Sexes" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.295-304.
- Salem, J. Christine (1980) "On Naming the Oppressor: What Woolf Avoids Saying in *A Room of One's Own*" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.209-218.
- Scott, Kathryn P. (1980) "Perceptions of Communication Competence: What's Good for the Goose is not Good for the Gander" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.199-209.
- Silvera, Jeanette (1980) "Generaic Masculine Words and Thinking" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.165-178.
- Wolfe, Susan & Stanley, Julia P. (1980) "Linguistic Problems with Patriarchal Reconstructions of Indo-European Culture: A Little More Than Kin, A Little Less Than Kind" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.227-239.

Feminist Studies

- Benjamin, Jessica (1980) "The Bonds of Love: Rational Violence and Erotic Domination" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.144-174.
- Clawson, Mary A. (1980) "Early Modern Fraternalism and the Patriarchal Family" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.368-391.
- Cook, Blanche W. "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.511-516.
- Diehl, Joanne F. (1980) "'Cartographies of Silence': Rich's *Common Language* and the Woman Poet" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.530-546.

- Dijkstra, Sandra (1980) "Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan: The Politics of Omission" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.290-303.
- Dubois, Ellen, Buhle, Mari J., Kaplan, Temma, Lerner, Gerda & Smith-Rosenberg, Carroll (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.¹
- Felstiner, Mary L. (1980) "Seeing *The Second Sex* Through the Second Wave" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.247-276.
- Fuchs, Jo-Ann P. (1980) "Female Eroticism in *The Second Sex*" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.304-313.
- Gidlow, Elsa (1980) "*Memoirs*" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.107-127.
- Glenn, Evelyn N. (1980) "The Dialectics of Wage Work: Japanese-American Women and Domestic Service, 1905-1940" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.432-471.
- Hull, Gloria T. (1980) "Researching Alice Dunbar-Nelson: A Personal and Literary Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.314-320.
- Kenedy, Liz & Lapidus, June (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.571-581.
- Kolodny, Annette (1980) "Dancing Through the Minefields: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice and Politics of Feminist Literary Criticism" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.1-25.
- Ladimer, Bethany (1980) "Madness and the Irrational: A Feminist Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.175-195.
- Lazarre, Jane (1980a) "Loving Men: Two Aspects" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.212-217.
- Ramas, Maria (1980) "Freud's Dora, Dora's Hysteria: The Negation of a Woman's Hysteria" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.472-510.
- Rapp, Rayna (1980) "Introduction to Elsa Gidlow's *Memoirs*" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.103-106.
- Rohrlich, Ruby (1980) "State Formation in Sumer and the Subjugation of Women" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.76-102.
- Ruddick, Sara (1980) "Maternal Thinking" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.342-367.
- Stansell, Christine (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.65-75.
- Ulrich, Laurel T. (1980) "A Friendly Neighbour: Social Dimensions of Daily Work in Northern Colonial New England" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.302-405.
- Van Allen, Judith (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.224-229.
- Vance, Carole (1980) "Gender Systems, Ideology and Sex Research: An Anthropological Analysis" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.129-143.

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society

- Allen, Sally G. & Hubbs, Joanna (1980) "Outrunning Atlanta: Feminine Destiny in Alchemical Transmutation" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.210-221.
- Baker, Susan W. (1980) "Biological Influences on Human Sex and Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.80-96.
- Burke, Carolyn (1980) "Introduction to Luce Irigaray's 'When Our Lips Speak Together'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.66-68.
- Carroll, Bernice A. (1980) "Political Science, Part II: International Politics, Comparative Politics, and Feminist Radicals" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.449-458.
- Diamond, Irene (1980) "Pornography and Repression: A Reconsideration" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.686-701.

¹ The symposium contained separate entries by each of the named contributors, therefore each has been accounted for separately in the sample totalling six contributions rather than one.

- Dye, Nancy S. (1980) "History of Childbirth in America" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.97-108.
- Goodman, Madeleine (1980) "Toward a Biology of Menopause" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.739-753.
- Gould, Meredith (1980) "The New Sociology" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.459-467.
- Green, Rayna (1980) "Native American Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.248-267.
- Janeway, Elizabeth (1980) "Who Is Sylvia? On the Loss of Sexual Paradigms" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.573-589.
- Joseph, Terri B. (1980) "Poetry as a Strategy of Power: The Case of Riffian Berber Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.418-434.
- Kraemer, Ross S. (1980) "The Conversion of Women to Ascetic Forms of Christianity" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.298-307.
- Leavitt, Judith W. (1980) "Birthing and Anesthesia: The Debate over Twilight Sleep" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.147-148.
- Leifer, Myra (1980) "Pregnancy" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.754-765.
- Martyna, Wendy (1980b) "Beyond the He/Man Approach: The Case for Non-Sexist Language" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.482-493.
- Miller, Patricia Y. & Fowlkes, Martha R. (1980) "Social & Behavioral Constructions of Female Sexuality" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.783-800.
- Modleski, Tania (1980) "The Disappearing Act: A Study of Harlequin Romances" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.435-448.
- Person, Ethel S. (1980) "Sexuality as the Mainstay of Identity: Psychoanalytic Perspectives" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.605-630.
- Petchesky, Rosalind P. (1980) "Reproductive Freedom: Beyond 'A Woman's Right to Choose'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.661-685.
- Powers, Maria (1980) "Menstruation and Reproduction: An Ogala Case Study" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.54-65.
- Register, Cheri (1980) "Literary Criticism" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.268-282.
- Rich, Adrienne (1980) "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.631-660.
- Ross, Ellen (1980) "'The Love Crisis': Couples Advice Books in the Late 1970s" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.109-122.
- Rossi, Alice S. (1980) "Life-Span Theories and Women's Lives" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.4-32.
- Rosaldo, Michelle Z. (1980) "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-Cultural Understanding" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3.
- Russell, Diane H. (1980) "Art History" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.468-481.
- Safa-Isfahani, Kaveh (1980) "Female-Centred World Views in Iranian Culture: Symbolic Representations of sexuality in 'Dramatic Games'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.33-53.

- Shulman, Alix K. (1980) "Sex and Power: Sexual Bases of Radical Feminism" " *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.590-604.
- Snitow, Ann B. (1980) "The Front Line: Notes on Sex in Novels by Women, 1969-1979" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.702-718.
- Strober, Myra & Tyack, David (1980) "Why do Women Teach and Men Manage? A Report on Research in Schools" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.494-503.
- Tidball, Elizabeth M. (1980) "Women's Colleges and Women Achievers Revisited" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.504-517.
- Tuchman, Gaye & Fortin, Nina (1980) "Edging Women Out: Some Suggestions about the Structure of Opportunities in the Victorian Novel" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.308-325.
- Walkowitz, Judith R. (1980b) "The Politics of Prostitution" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.123-135.
- Weisskopf, Susan (1980) "Maternal Sexuality and Asexual Motherhood" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.766-782.
- Wood, Elizabeth (1980) "Women in Music" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.283-297.

Books

- Butler, Matilda & Paisley, William (1980) *Women and the Mass Media: Sourcebook for Research and Action* New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Cantarow, Ellen (1980) *Moving the Mountain: Women Working for Social Change* Old Westbury: Feminist Press.
- Dall, Caroline Wells Healey (1980) *'Alongside'* New York: Amo Press.
- Eisenstein, Hester & Jardine, Alice (eds) (1980) *The Future of Difference* New York: Bernard College Women's Center.
- Evans, Sara (1980b) *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* New York: Vintage Books.
- Friday, Nancy (1980) *Men's Sexual Fantasies: The Triumph of Love Over Rage* New York: Delacorte Press.
- Katz, Esther & Rapone, Anita (eds) (1980) *Women's Experience in America: An Historical Anthology* New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Lazarre, Jane (1980b) *On Loving Men* New York: Dial Press.
- Lederer, Laura (ed.) (1980) *Take Back The Night: Women on Pornography* New York: Morrow.
- O'Kelly, Charlotte G. (1980) *Women and Men in Society* New York: D. Van Nostrand Co.

Appendix III: Britain 1998 Sample Texts

Feminist Review

- Attwood, Fiona (1998) "Wierd Lullaby: Jane Campion's *The Piano*" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.85-101.
- Breitenbach, Esther, Brown, Alice & Myers, Fiona (1998) "Understanding Women in Scotland" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.44-65.
- Prokhovnik, Raia (1998) "Public and Private Citizenship: From Gender Invisibility to Feminist Inclusiveness" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.84-103.
- Smyth, Lisa (1998) "Narratives of Irishness and the Problem of Abortion" The X Case 1992" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.61-83.
- Spence, Jean (1998) "Women, Wives and the Campaign Against Pit Closures in County Durham: Understanding the Vane Tempest Vigil" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.33-60.

Women's Studies International Forum

- Andrew, Alison & Montague, Jane. (1998) "Women's Friendship at Work" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.355-361.
- Beetham, Margaret (1998) "The Reinvention of the English Domestic Woman: Class and 'Race' in the 1980s Woman's Magazine" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.223-233.
- Bhopal, Kalwant (1998) "South Asian Women in East London: Motherhood and Social Support" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.485-492.
- Birke, Lynda & Whitworth, Rosalind (1998) "Seeking Knowledge: Women, Science and Islam" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.147-159.
- Bond, Meg & Bywaters, Paul (1998) "Working it out for Ourselves: Women Learning about Hormone Replacement Therapy" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.65-76.
- Bush, Julia (1998) "Edwardian Ladies and the 'Race' Dimensions of British Imperialism" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.277-289.
- Codd, Helen (1998) "Older Women, Criminal Justice and Women's Studies" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.183-192.
- Crossley, Michele L. (1998) Women Living with a Long-Term HIV Positive Diagnosis: Problems, Concerns and Ways of Ascribing Meaning" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.521-533.
- Dhaliwal, Spinder (1998) "Silent Contributors: Asian Female Entrepreneurs and Women in Business" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.463-474.
- Doy, Gen (1998) "More than Meets the Eye...Representations of Black Women in Mid-Nineteenth Century French Photography" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.305-319.
- Epstein, Debbie & Steinberg, Deborah L. (1998) "American Dreamin': Discoursing Liberally on the *Oprah Winfrey Show*" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.77-94.
- Hague, Gill (1998) "Interagency Work and Domestic Violence in the UK" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.441-449.
- Hardill, Irene & MacDonald, Sandra (1998) "Choosing to Relocate: An Examination of the Impact of Expatriate Work on Dual-Careers Households" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.21-29.
- Hurley, Siobhan L. (1998) "Out of India: The Journeys of the Begam of Bhopal, 1901-1930" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.263-276.
- Kerr, E. Anne (1998) "Toward a Feminist Natural Science: Linking Theory and Practice" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.95-109.
- Oakley, Ann (1998) "Science, Gender and Women's Liberation: An Argument Against Postmodernism" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.133-146.

- Raghuram, Parvati & Hardill, Irene (1998) "Negotiating a Market: A Case Study of and Asian Woman in Business" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.475-483.
- Reay, Diane (1998) "Surviving in Dangerous Places: Working-Class Women, Women's Studies and Higher Education" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.11-19.
- Rowbotham, Judith (1998) "'Hear and Indian Sister's Plea': Reporting the Work of Nineteenth Century Female Missionaries" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.247-261.
- Tuson, Penelope (1998) "Mutiny Narratives and the Imperial Feminine: European Women's Accounts of the rebellion in India in 1857" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.291-303.
- Twells, Alison (1998) "'Happy English Children': Class, Ethnicity and the Making of Missionary Women in the Early Nineteenth Century" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.235-245.
- Wilkinson, Sue (1998) "Focus Groups in Feminist Research: Power, Interaction and the Co-Construction of Meaning" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.111-125.

Books

- Adam, Alison (1998) *Artificial Knowing: Gender and the Thinking Machine* London: Routledge.
- Allwood, Gill (1998) *French Feminisms: Gender and Violence in Contemporary Theory* London: UCL.
- Chant, Sylvia H. & McIlwaine, Cathy (1998) *Three Generations, Two Genders, One World: Women and Men in a Changing Century* London: Zed Books.
- Charles, Nickie & Hintjens, Helen (eds) (1998) *Gender, Ethnicity, and Political Ideologies* London: Routledge.
- Chedgzoy, Kate, Hansen, Melanie & Trill, Suzanne (eds) (1998) *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Foxhall, Lin & Salmon, John (eds) (1998) *When Men Were Men: masculinity, power, and identity in classical antiquity* London: Routledge.
- Ghoussoub, Mai (1998) *Leaving Beirut: Women and the Wars Within* London: Saqi Books.
- Haw, Kaye (1998) *Educating Muslim Girls: Shifting Discourses* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- McGlynn, Clare (ed.) (1998) *Legal Feminisms: theory and practice* Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Plowden, Alison (1998) *Women All On Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* Stroud: Sutton Pub.
- Robinson, Mary (1998) *A Letter to the Women of England on the Injustice of Mental Subordination* Poole: Woodstock Books.
- Yeo, Eileen Janes (ed.) (1998) *Radical Femininity: Women's self-representation in the public sphere* Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Appendix IV: USA 1998 Sample Texts

Women's Studies International Forum

- Brayboy, Mary E. & Morgan, Mary Y. (1998) "Voices of Indianness: The Lived World of Native American Women" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.341-354.
- Davis, Ruth E. (1998) "Discovering 'Creative Essences' in African America Women: The Construction of Meaning Around Inner Resources" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.493-504.
- Dodds, Dinah (1998) "Five Years After Unification: East German Women in Transition" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.175-182.
- Ferri, Beth A. & Gregg, Noel (1998) "Women with Disabilities: Missing Voices" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.429-439.
- Gillmartin, Patricia & Brunn, Stanley (1998) "The Representation of Women in Political Cartoons of the 1995 World Conference on Women" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.535-549.
- Jenefsky, Cindy & Miller, Diane H. (1998) "Phallic Intrusion: Girl-Girl Sex in *Penthouse*" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.375-385.
- Kampwirth, Karen (1998) "Legislating Personal Politics in Sandanista Nicaragua, 1979-1992" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.53-64.
- Kauanui, J. Kehaulani (1998) "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6, pp.681-693.
- Raymond, Janice G. (1998) "Prostitution as Violence Against Women: NGO Stonewalling in Beijing and Elsewhere" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.1-9.
- Soh, Sarah C. (1998) "Uncovering the Truth About the 'Comfort Women'" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.451-454.
- Uchida, Aki (1998) "The Orientalization of Asian Women in America" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.161-174.
- Woollacott, Angela (1998) "The Fragmentary Subject: Feminist History, Official Records, and Self-Representation" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.329-339.

Feminist Studies

- Allen, Judith A. & Kitch, Sally L. (1998) "Disciplined by the Disciplines? The Need for an Interdisciplinary Research Programme in Women's Studies" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.275-299.
- Booth, Karen M. (1998) "National Mother, Global Whore, and Transnational Femocrats: The Politics of AIDS and the Construction of Women at the World Health Organization" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.115-139.
- Boris, Eileen (1998) "Scholarship and Activism: The Case of Welfare Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.27-31.
- Bowen, Angela (1998) "Testifying: My Experience in Women's Studies Doctoral Training at Clark University" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.374-386.
- Boxer, Marilyn J. (1998a) "Remapping the University: The Promise of the Women's Studies Ph.D." *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.387-402.
- Doan, Laura (1998) "Passing Fashions: Reading Female Masculinities in the 1920s" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.663-700.

- Friedman, Susan S. (1998) "(Inter)Disciplinarity and the Question of the Woman's Studies Ph.D." *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.301-325.
- Guy-Sheftall, Beverly (1998a) "Engaging Difference: Racial and Global Perspectives in Graduate Women's Studies Education" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.327-332.
- Hausman, Bernice L. (1998) "Sex Before Gender: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the Evolutionary Paradigm of Utopia" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.489-510.
- Kittay, Eva F. (1998) "Dependency, Equality, and Welfare" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.32-43.
- Kornbluh, Felicia (1998) "The Goals of the National Welfare Rights Movement: Why We Need Them Thirty Years Later" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.65-78.
- McDermott, Patrice (1998) "The Meaning and Uses of Feminism in Introductory Women's Studies Textbooks" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.403-427.
- McLerran, Jennifer (1998) "Disciplined Subjects and Docile Bodies in the Work of Contemporary Artist Jana Sterbak" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.535-552.
- Michel, Sonya (1998) "Childcare and Welfare (in)Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.44-54.
- Mink, Gwendolyn (1998) "The Lady and the Tramp (II): Feminist Welfare Politics, Poor Single Mothers, and the Challenge of Welfare Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.55-64.
- Minnich, Elizabeth K. (1998) "Feminist Attacks on Feminisms: Patriarchy's {rpdigal Daughters" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.159-175.
- Moses, Clare G. (1998) "Made in America: 'French Feminism' in Academia" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.241-274.
- Nelson, Margaret K. & Smith, Joan, (1998) "Economic Restructuring, Household Strategies, and Gender: A Case Study of a Rural Community" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.79-114.
- Newton, Judith (1998) "White Guys" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.572-598.
- Polier, Nicole (1998) "True Transgressions: Refusal and Recolonization in the Narrative of a Papuan Migrant 'Bighead'" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.511-534.
- Stewart, Abigail, Herman, Anne & Smith, Sidonie (1998) "The Joint Doctoral Program at the university of Michigan" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.356-365.
- Williams, Rhonda M. & Peterson, Carla L. (1998) "The Color of Memory: Interpreting Twentieth-Century US Social Policy from a Nineteenth-Century Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.7-25.
- Yee, Shirley (1998) "Establishing an International Doctoral Program in Women's Studies at the University of Washington" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.366-373.

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society

- Bing-Canar, Jenifer & Zerkel, Mary (1998) "Reading the Media and Myself: Experiences in Critical Media Literacy with Young Arab-American Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society Special Issue on Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.735-743.
- Carter, Mia (1998) "The Politics of Pleasure: Cross-Cultural Autobiographic Performance in the Video Works of Sadie Benning" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society Special Issue on Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.745-769.

- Esquibel, Catriona R. (1998) "Memories of Girlhood: Chicana Lesbian Fictions" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.645-682.
- Fehrenbach, Heide (1998) "Rehabilitating Fatherland: Race and German Remasculinization" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.107-127.
- Fleischman, Suzanne (1998) "Gender, the Personal, and Discourse: A Review Essay" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.975-1016.
- Foster, Susan L. (1998) "Choreographies of Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.1-34.
- Fox, Mary F. (1998) "Women in Science and Engineering: Theory, Practice, and Policy in Programs" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.201-223.
- Hegland, Mary E. (1998) "The Power of Paradox in Muslim Women's *Majales*: North-West Pakistani Mourning Rituals as Sites of Contestation over Religious Politics, Ethnicity, and Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.391-428.
- James, Stanlie M. (1998) "Shades of Othering: Reflections on Female Circumcision/ Genital Mutilation" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.1031-1048.
- Jeffords, Susan (1998) "The 'Remasculinization of Germany in the 1950s: Discussion" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.163-169.
- Joseph, Suad (1998) "Comment on Majid's 'The Politics of Feminism in Islam': Critique of Politics and the Politics of Critique" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.363-369.
- Kaufmann, Dorothy (1998) "The Story of Two Women: Dominique Aury and Edith Thomas" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.883-905.
- Kuo, Leonore (1998) "Secondary Discrimination as a Standard for feminist Social Policy: Norplant and Probation, a Case Study" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.907-944.
- Landsman, Gail H. (1998) "Reconstructing Motherhood in the Age of 'Perfect' Babies: Mothers of Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.69-199.
- Mayer, Ann E. (1998) "Comment on Majid's 'The Politics of Feminism in Islam'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.369-277.
- O'Neil, Kelly (1998) "No Adults Are Pulling The Strings and We Like It That Way" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.611-618.
- Oyewumi, Oyeronke (1998) "De-Confounding Gender: Feminist Theorizing and western Culture, Comment on Hawkesworth's 'Confounding Gender'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.1049-1062.
- Poiger, Uta G. (1998) "A New 'Western' Hero? Reconstructing German Masculinity in the 1950s" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.147-162.
- Porter, Mary A. (1998) "Resisting Uniformity at Mwana Kuponu Girls' School: Cultural Reflections in an Educational Setting" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.619-643.
- Projansky, Sarah (1998) "Girls Who Act Like Women Who Fly: Jessica Dubroff as Cultural Troublemaker" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.771-807.
- Rosenberg, Jessica & Garofalo, Gitana (1998) "Riot Grrrl: Revolutions from Within" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.809-841.
- Rosser, Sue V. (1998) "Applying Feminist Theories to Women in Science Programs" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.171-200.
- Shih, Shu-Mei (1998) "Gender and A New Geopolitics of Desire: The Seduction of Mainland Women in Taiwan and Hong Kong Media" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.287-319.

Wald, Gayle (1998) "Just a Girl? Rock Music, Feminism, and the Cultural Construction of Female Youth" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.585-610.

Books

- Abu-Lughod, Lila (ed.) (1998) *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Chancer, Lynn S. (1998) *Reconcilable Differences: Confronting Beauty, Pornography, and the Future of Feminism* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Coryell, Janet L., Swain, Martha H., Treadway, Sandra G. & Turner, Elizabeth H. (eds) (1998) *Beyond Image and Convention: Explorations in Southern Women's History* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Daly, Mary (1998) *Quintessence - Realizing the Archaic Future: a Radical Elemental Feminist Manifesto* Boston: Beacon Press.
- di Leonardo, Micaela (1998) *Exotics At Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diggs, Nancy. Brown (1998) *Steel Butterflies: Japanese Women and the American Experience* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Fay, Elizabeth (1998) *A Feminist Introduction to Romanticism* Malden: Blackwell.
- Feldhaus, Anne (ed.) (1998) *Images of Women in Maharashtrian Society* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hahner, June E. (ed.) (1998) *Women Through Women's Eyes: Latin American Women in Nineteenth-Century Travel Accounts* Wilmington: SR Books.
- Hershatter, Gail, Honig, Emily, Mann, Susan & Rofel, Lisa (eds) (1998) *Guide to Women's Studies in China* Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for Chinese Studies.
- Jong, Erica (1998) *what do Women want?: Bread, Roses, Sex, Power* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.
- Lieberman, Sally Taylor (1998) *The Mother and Narrative Politics in Modern China* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Ling, Huping (1998) *Surviving on the Gold Mountain: A History of Chinese American Women and Their Lives* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Longmire, Linda & Merrill, Lisa (eds) (1998) *Untying the Tongue: Gender, Power, and the Word* Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Myers, Lena Wright (1998) *Black Male Socialization: Revisited in the Minds of Respondents* Stamford: JAI Press.
- Nelson, Dana D. (1998) *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men* Durham: Duke University Press.
- Roberts, Cokie (1998) *We Are Our Mothers' Daughters* New York: Morrow.
- Rogers, Lori (1998) *Feminine Nation: Performance, Gender, and Resistance in the Works of John McGahern and Neil Jordan* Lanham: University Press of America.
- Rothblum, Esther D., Weinstock, Jaqueline. S. & Morris, Jessica (eds) (1998) *Women in the Antarctic* New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Staudt, Kathleen A. (1998) *Policy, Politics and Gender: Women Gaining Ground* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Walker, Margaret Urban (1998) *Moral Understandings: A Feminist Study in Ethics* New York: Routledge.

Appendix V: 1980 - Texts excluded from the sample due to the author or editor sex and/or location.

The reason for exclusion appears in brackets at the end of each bibliographic entry: i.e. as (sex) or (location) or (sex & location).

A: Journals:

Feminist Review

- Delphy, Christine (1980) "A Materialist Feminism is Possible (translated by Diana Leonard)" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.79-105. (location).
Heisch, Allison (1980) "Queen Elizabeth I and the Persistence of Patriarchy" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.45-56. (location).
Tabari, Azar (1980) "The Enigma of Veiled Iranian Women" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.19-32. (location).

Women's Studies International Quarterly

- Coleman, Nancy (1980) "Report on the First Nordic Women's Prize in Literature" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1. no.1. pp.115-120. (location).
Evans, Richard J. (1980) "Bourgeois Feminists and Women Socialists in Germany 1894-1914: Lost Opportunity or Inevitable Conflict?" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.355-376. (sex).
Fichteluis, Anna, Johansson, Irene & Nordin, Kerstin (1980) "Three Investigations of Sex-Associated Speech Variation in Day School" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.219-227. (location).
Goldsmith, Andrea E. (1980) "Notes on the Tyranny of Language Use" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.179-192. (location).
Hellinger, Marris (1980) "'For Men Must Work, and Women Must Weep': Sexism in English Language Textbooks used in German Schools" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.267-278. (location).
Jones, Deborah (1980) "Gossip: Notes on Oral Culture" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.193-198. (location).
Larsson, Lizbeth (1980) "Women's Reading" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.227-284. (location).
MacKay, Donald & Konishi, Toshi (1980) "Personification and the Pronoun Problem" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.149-162. (sex).
Stewart, Penni (1980) "He Admits...But She Confesses" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *Women and Media* vol.3, no.1. pp.105-114. (location).

Feminist Studies

- Arney, William (1980) "Maternal-Infant Bonding: The Politics of Falling in Love with Your Child" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.547-570. (sex).
Le Doeuff, Michele (1980) "Simone de Beauvoir and Existentialism" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.277-289. (location).

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society

- Friedman, Richard C., Hurt, Stephen W., Arnoff, Michael S., & Clarkin, John (1980) "Behavior and the Menstrual Cycle" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.719-738. (sex).
- Irigaray, Luce (1980) "When Our Lips Speak Together (translated by Carolyn Burke)" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.69-79. (location).
- Johnson, Allan G. (1980) "On the Prevalence of Rape in the United States" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.136-146. (sex).
- Jones, Jennifer M. & Lovejoy, Francis H. (1980) "Discrimination Against Women Academics in Australian Universities" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.518-526. (location).
- Lawson, Ronald & Barton, Stephen E. (1980) "Sex Roles in Social Movements: A Case Study of the Tenant Movement in New York City" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.230-247. (sex).
- Monter, William E. (1980) "Women in Calvinist Geneva (1550-1800)" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.189-209. (sex).

B: Books:

All books noted below were replaced by other texts from the database.

British Sample Exclusions:

- Kanner, Barbara (ed.) (1980) *The Women of England: from Anglo-Saxon times to the present: interpretive bibliographical essays* London: Mansell Information Publishing.(location).
- Okin, Susan M. (1980) *Women in Western Political Thought* London: Virago.(location).
- Raymond, Janice (1980) *The Transsexual Empire* London: The Women's Press. (location).
- Vicinus, Martha (ed.) (1980) *A Widening Sphere: changing roles of Victorian women* London: Methuen. (location).
- Vicinus, Martha (ed.) (1980) *Suffer And Be Still: women in the Victorian age* London: Methuen.(location).

USA Sample Exclusions

No books were replaced by other texts in the USA sample due to author(s) or editor(s) sex or location.

Appendix VI: 1998 - Texts excluded from the sample due to the author or editor sex and/or location.

The reason for exclusion appears in brackets at the end of each bibliographic entry: i.e. as (sex) or (location) or (sex and location).

A: Journals:

Feminist Review

- Baksh-Soodeen, Rawwida (1998) "Issues of Difference in Contemporary Caribbean Feminism" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.74-85. (location).
- Barrieau, Eudine (1998) "Theorizing Gender Systems and the Project of Modernity in the Twentieth-Century Caribbean" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.186-210. (sex & location).
- Beckles, Hilary (1998) "Historicizing Slavery in West Indian Feminisms" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.34-56. (location).
- Brereton, Bridget (1998) "Gendered Testimonies: Autobiographies, Diaries and Letters by Women as Sources for Caribbean History" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.143-163. (location).
- Brush, Pippa (1998) "Metaphors of Inscription: Discipline, Plasticity and the Rhetoric of Choice" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.22-43. (location).
- Byron, Jessica & Thorburn, Diana (1998) "Gender and International Relations: A Global Perspective and Issues for the Caribbean" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.211-232. (location).
- Colon-Warren, Alice E. & Algeria-Ortega, Idsa (1998) "Shattering the Illusion of Development: The Changing Status of Women and Challenges for the Feminist Movement in Puerto Rico" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.101-117. (location).
- Cuales, Sonia M. (1998) "In Search of our Memory: Gender in the Netherlands Antilles" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.86-100. (location).
- Lewis, Linden (1998) "Masculinity and the dance of the dragon: Reading Lovelace Discursively" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.164-185. (sex & location).
- Mohammed, Patricia (1998) "Towards Indigenous Feminist Theorizing in the Caribbean" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.6-33. (location).
- N'Zengou-Tayo, Marie-Jose (1998) "Fanm se poto mitan': Haitian Women, the Pillar of Society" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.118-142. (location).
- Paisley, Fiona (1980) "Citizens of their World: Australian Feminism and Indigenous Rights in the International Context, 1920s and 1930s" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.66-84. (location).
- Reddock, Rhoda (1998) Women's Organizations and Movements in the Commonwealth Caribbean: The Response to Global Economic Crisis in the 1980s" *Feminist Review* Special Issue on *Rethinking Caribbean Difference* no.59, pp.57-73. (location).
- Ryang, Sonia (1998) "Love and Colonialism in Takamure Itsue's Feminism: A Postcolonial Critique" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.1-25. (location).
- Sarwaswati, Sunindyo (1998) "When the Earth is Female and the Nation is Mother: Gender, The Armed Forces and Nationalism" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.1-21. (location).

Women's Studies International Forum

- Anderlini-D'onofrio, Serena (1998) "Neither 'War Bride' nor 'White Widow': The Discursive Construction of Italian Women in America" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4. pp.363-374. (location).
- Aronson, Jane (1998) "Lesbians Giving and Receiving care: Stretching Conceptualizations of Caring and Community" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5. pp.505-519. (location).
- Carpenter, Belinda (1998) "The Prostitute and the Client: Challenging the Dualisms" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4. pp.387-399. (location).
- Ganguly-Scrase, Ruchira & Julian, Roberta (1998) "Minority Women and the Experiences of Migration" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.633-648. (location).
- Grace, Marty (1998) "The Work of Caring for Young Children: Priceless or Worthless?" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4. pp.401-413. (location).
- Mackie, Vera (1998) "Dialogue, Distance and Difference: Feminism in Contemporary Japan" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.599-615. (location).
- Marsh, Serina T. (1998) "Migrating Feminisms: Maligned Overstay or Model Citizen" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.665-680. (location).
- McFallane, Judith (1998) "Looking Through the Glass Darkly: A reading of Bronwyn Davies' *Shades of Glass: Children Reading and Writing Beyond gendered Identities*" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2. pp.199-208. (location).
- Patton, Wendy & Mannison, Mary (1998) "Beyond Learning to Endure: Women's Acknowledgement of Coercive Sexuality" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1. pp.31-40. (location).
- Ram, Kalpana (1998) "Na Shariram Nadhi, My Body is Mine: The Urban Women's Health Movement in India and its Negotiation of Modernity" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.617-631. (location).
- Rozarlo, Sarti (1998) "On Being Australian and Muslim: Muslim Women as Defenders of Islamic Heritage" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.649-661. (location).
- Ryang, Sonia (1998) "Nationalist Inclusion or Emancipatory Identity? North Korean Women in Japan" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia/Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6. pp.581-597. (location).
- Seymour, Anne (1998) "Aetology of the Sexual Abuse of Children: An Extended Feminist Perspective" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4. pp.415-427. (location).
- Steyn, Melissa (1998) "A New Agenda: Restructuring Feminism in South Africa" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1. pp.41-52. (location).
- Tye, Diane & Powers, Ann M. (1998) "Gender, Resistance and Play: Bachelorette Parties in Atlantic Canada" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5. pp.551-561. (location).
- Widerberg, Karen (1998) "Teaching Gender Through Writing 'Experience Stories'" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2. pp.193-198. (location).

Feminist Studies

- Armatage, Kay (1998) "Collaborating on Women's Studies: The University of Toronto Model" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2. pp.347-355. (location).
- Coates, Jacky, Dodds, Michelle & Jenson, Jodi (1998) "'Isn't Just Being Here Political Enough?': Feminist Action-Oriented Research as a Challenge to Graduate Women's Studies" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The*

- Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2. pp.333-346. (location).
- Luke, Brian (1998) "Violent Love: Hunting, Heterosexuality, and the Erotics of Men's Predation" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.627-655. (sex).
- Ross, Marlon B. (1998) "In Search of Black Men's Masculinities" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.599-526. (sex).
- Zulu, L. (1998) "Role of Women in the Reconstruction and Development of the New Democratic South Africa" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.147-157. (location).

Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society

- Alam, S. M. Shamsul (1998) "Women in the Era of Modernity and Islamic Fundamentalism: The Case of Taslima Nasrin or Bangladesh" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.2, pp.429-461. (sex).
- Bray, Abigail & Colebrook, Claire (1998) "The Haunted Flesh: Corporeal Feminism and the politics of (Dis)Embodiment" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.24. no.1, pp.35-68. (location).
- Byers, Michele (1998) "Gender/Sexuality/Desire: Subversion of Difference and Construction of Loss in the Adolescent Drama *My So-Called Life*" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23. no.3, pp.711-734. (location).
- Cameron, Deborah (1998) "Gender, Language, and Discourse: A Review Essay" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.4, pp.945-974. (location).
- Duong, Thi T. (1998) "Changing My Life: How I Came to the Vietnamese Revolution (trans. and introduced by Mark Sidel)" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.4, pp.1017-1029. (location - author, sex - introducer).
- Khan, Shahnaz (1998) "Muslim Women: Negotiations in the Third Space" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.2, pp.463-494. (location).
- Majid, Anouar (1998) "Reply to Joseph and Mayer: Critique as a Dehegemonizing Practice" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.2, pp.377-389. (sex).
- Majid, Anouar (1998) "The Politics of Feminism in Islam" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.2, pp.321-361. (sex).
- Meijer, Irene & Prins, Baukue (1998) "How Bodies Come to Matter: An Interview With Judith Butler" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.23. no.2, pp.275-286. (location).
- Moeller, Robert G. (1998) "'The Last Soldiers of the Great War' and Tales of Family Reunion in the Federal Republic of Germany" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.28. no.4, pp.129-145. (sex).
- Moeller, Robert G. (1998) "The 'Remasculinization' of Germany in the 1950s: Introduction" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.24. no.4, pp.101-106. (sex).
- Venkatesh, Sudhir A. (1998) "Gender and Outlaw Capitalism: A Historical Account of the Black Sisters United 'Girl Gang'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23. no.3, pp.683-709. (sex).

B: Books:

Apart from the Canadian authored texts in the USA sample noted by *, all books noted below were replaced by other texts from the database.

British Sample Exclusions:

- Hays-Gilpin, Kelley & Whitley, David S. (eds) (1998) *Reader in Gender Archaeology* London: Routledge (location).
- Landes, Joan B. (ed) (1998) *Feminism, The Public And The Private* Oxford: Oxford University Press (location).

USA Sample Exclusions:

- Dube, Allison (1998) *Fire With Water: generations and genders of Western political thought* Calgary: Parhelion Press (location) *
- Jok, Madut J. (1998) *Militarization, Gender, and Reproductive Health in South Sudan* Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press (sex).
- Kealey, Linda (1998) *Enlisting Women For The Cause: women, labour, and the left in Canada, 1890-1920* Toronto: University of Toronto Press (location) *
- O'Hara, Patricia (1998) *Partners in Production?: women, farm, and family in Ireland* New York: Berghahn Books (location).
- Sherwin, Susan & the Feminist Healthcare Ethics Network. (1998) *The Politics of Women's Health: exploring agency and autonomy* Philadelphia: Temple University Press (location) *

**Appendix VII: Frequencies and Percentages of Book Types in the Sampling
Frame (total number of books = 569)**

First Place of Publication	Single author	Joint author	Single editor	Joint editor	Total
North America 1980	65	16	16	17	114
Britain 1980	40	3	6	3	52
North America 1998	187	13	28	48	276
Britain 1998	65	8	18	36	127
Total	357	40	68	104	569

Table I: Frequencies by first place of publication and book type

First Place of Publication	Single author	Joint author	Single editor	Joint editor	Total
North America 1980	11	3	3	3	20
Britain 1980	7	1	1	1	10
North America 1998	33	2	5	9	49
Britain 1998	11	1	3	6	21
Total	62	7	12	19	100

Table II: Percentages by first place of publication and book type (whole nos.)

Appendix VIII: Hypotheses

- 1) A shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA during the 1980s and 1990s.
- 2) During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship has become increasingly:
 - a) concerned with cultural issues, such as language, representation, symbolisation and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) ones and
 - b) individualist rather than collectivist.
- 3) The shifts in the content of feminist scholarship are related to the shift in dominant theoretical perspectives informing feminist academic work.
- 4) Intellectual shifts are related to material and cultural changes in the contexts where feminist scholarship occurs.

Appendix IX: Summary of Key Findings For Hypotheses One and Two

Hypothesis One*: Britain and the USA 1980	Hypothesis One*: Britain and the USA 1998	Shift Confirmed
<p>Expected Dominant Perspectives: Historical Materialist</p> <p>Unconfirmed</p> <p>Evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted:</p> <p>Historical materialist perspectives were highly visible in both sample groups.</p> <p>In contrast, compared to historical materialist perspectives, poststructuralist influence, although not entirely absent, was negligible.</p> <p>Key reasons for not confirming historical materialist dominance:</p> <p>Tensions about the extent to which historical materialism can or should be employed within a number of texts exhibiting at least some historical materialist tendencies.</p> <p>Lack of clarity about the material base in a number of texts. Thus, these texts tend to waver between essentialist and idealist arguments.</p> <p>More generally:</p> <p>Two key internally heterogeneous perspectives were identifiable in the sample. These two perspectives can be broadly labelled socialist feminism - attending to capitalism and patriarchy and radical feminism - focussing attention more directly onto patriarchy.</p>	<p>Expected Dominant Perspectives: Poststructuralist</p> <p>Unconfirmed</p> <p>Evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted:</p> <p>Both sample groups demonstrated a significant rise in the proportion of texts that were influenced by poststructuralist perspectives.</p> <p>Key reasons for not confirming poststructuralist dominance:</p> <p>Evidence of poststructuralism not being a particularly heavy influence in relation to other perspectives in many texts and absent from a number of texts.</p> <p>Historical materialist insights were still highly visible in many texts, including those that mixed it with poststructuralism or other perspectives. However, compared to the 1980 sample, historical materialism appears to have become more historical and dialectical and the structures it addresses have multiplied.</p> <p>More generally:</p> <p>Both sample groups demonstrated an enormous rise in the proportion of texts that demonstrated evidence of being influenced by perspectives broadly labelled black or multiracial feminism. This rise was irrespective of the specific philosophical insights underpinning particular texts.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There was evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted but they were not strong enough to confirm the shifts in dominance that were predicted by the hypothesis.</p>

* Hypothesis One: A shift has occurred in the dominant theoretical perspectives (broadly, historical materialist to poststructuralist) informing feminist academic work in Britain and the USA during the 1980s and 1990s.

Table III: Summary of Key Findings For Hypothesis One

Hypothesis Two - Part A* Britain and the USA 1980	Hypothesis Two - Part A* Britain and the USA 1998	Shift Confirmed
<p>Expected Emphasis: material rather than cultural issues</p> <p>Unconfirmed</p> <p>Both sample groups demonstrated that the overall emphasis was on a mixture of concerns rather than simply material issues.</p> <p>Evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted:</p> <p>In texts that were particularly heavily influenced by historical materialism material issues appeared to be the primary concern even though these texts tended to exhibit a mixing of concerns. However, given that ideology critique is an important feature of accounts influenced by historical materialism the mixing of concerns in texts exhibiting historical materialist influence is not surprising.</p> <p>Contrary to what was predicted:</p> <p>Cultural issues, in the form of values, language and representation appeared to be the key focus of many of the texts that did not seem to exhibit the characteristics that are associated with historical materialism. Whether intended by the authors or not, these texts were those that appeared to leave the question of whether they were primarily influenced by idealism or ontological materialism open to debate.</p>	<p>Expected Emphasis: cultural rather than material issues</p> <p>Unconfirmed</p> <p>Both sample groups demonstrated that the overall emphasis was on a mixture of concerns rather than simply cultural issues.</p> <p>Evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted:</p> <p>In texts that were particularly heavily influenced by poststructuralism cultural issues appeared to be the central focus.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There was evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted but they were not strong enough to confirm the shifts in dominance that were predicted by the hypothesis.</p>

* Hypothesis Two - Part A: During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship has become increasingly concerned with cultural issues, such as, language, representation symbolization and discourse, rather than social and economic (i.e. material) issues.

Table IV: Summary of Key Findings for Hypothesis Two - Part A

Hypothesis Two - Part B* Britain and the USA 1980	Hypothesis Two - Part B* Britain and the USA 1998	Shift Confirmed
<p>Expected Emphasis: Collectivist</p> <p>Confirmed</p> <p>The dominant outlook in both sample groups was collectivist.</p> <p>Texts influenced by the key perspectives (broadly, socialist and radical feminism) tended to portray relatively, internally undifferentiated large systems (e.g. male values, the domestic mode of production or some form of mixing of capitalism or patriarchy) that were assumed to have relatively homogeneous negative effects on women.</p>	<p>Expected Emphasis: Individualist</p> <p>Unconfirmed</p> <p>The overall dominant outlook in both sample groups was addressing the tensions between an individualist and collectivist outlook.</p> <p>Evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted:</p> <p>In both sample groups there was a much greater stress on differences among women than there was in the 1980 sample and many texts were emphasising the multiple and shifting nature of individual women's identity. In addition, there was also a marked increase in the proportion of texts that were seeking to analyse women's agency in both sample groups.</p> <p>The stress on difference and agency seemed to indicate evidence of an individualist outlook in a few of the texts that were particularly heavily influenced by poststructuralist perspectives.</p> <p>Key reasons for not confirming an individualist outlook:</p> <p>In most of the texts the heightened attention to agency and difference did not seem to result in a purely individualist outlook. For example, texts addressed specific <i>groups</i> of women, conducted analysis at various levels - demonstrating attempts to understand connections among women as well as demonstrating sensitivity to individuality - and/or highlighted the constraining as well as enabling nature of material and cultural contexts. Therefore, the key concern of the majority of these texts seemed to be attempting to understand the tensions between an individualist and collectivist outlook.</p>	<p>No</p> <p>There was evidence of some trends in line with what was predicted but they were not strong enough to confirm the shifts in dominance that were predicted by the hypothesis.</p>

* Hypothesis Two - Part B: During the 1980s and 1990s the content of feminist scholarship has become more individualist than collectivist.

Table V: Summary of Key Findings for Hypothesis Two - Part B

Appendix X: Hypotheses for guiding second stage analysis in future research that have been derived from the key findings that emerged during the exploration of Hypotheses One, Two and Three.

- 1) In 1980 historical materialist perspectives were highly visible in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.
- 2) Compared to historical materialist perspectives, the influence of poststructuralist perspectives was negligible in academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980.
- 3) Although not the only perspectives in circulation, two internally heterogeneous key perspectives were visible in feminist scholarship in Britain and the USA in 1980: broadly, socialist feminism - attending to the systems of capitalism and patriarchy - and radical feminism - focussing more attention directly on the system of patriarchy.
- 4) By the late 1990s historical materialist perspectives were still influencing a relatively large proportion of feminist academics in a positive way in Britain and the USA.
- 5) Between 1980 and the late 1990s historical materialist perspectives within academic feminism in Britain and the USA had become more historical and dialectical and the structures they addressed had multiplied.
- 6) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the influence of poststructuralist perspectives in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.
- 7) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the influence of internally, philosophically heterogeneous perspectives that can be broadly labelled Black or multiracial feminism.
- 8) Overall, a reasonably even mixture of material (i.e. social and economic) and cultural (i.e. language, representation, symbolisation and discourse) issues were addressed by academic feminism in Britain and the USA in 1980 and in 1998.
- 9) The particular emphasis placed on material and/or cultural issues by an academic feminist is related to the theoretical perspective or specific mixing of perspectives that influence her in a positive way.
- 10) In 1980 the dominant outlook of academic feminism in Britain and the USA was collectivist - on the whole, women tended to be addressed as members of a relatively

homogenous group who were oppressed by relatively static and internally undifferentiated systems that were assumed to have relatively homogenous negative effects on women.

11) Between 1980 and the late 1990s there had been a significant rise in the concern with:

- a) multiple differences among women,
 - b) the multiple identities of individual women and
 - c) women's agency
- in academic feminism in Britain and the USA.

12) By the late 1990s the dominant outlook in academic feminism in Britain and the USA was one that attempted to address the tensions between a collectivist outlook and an individualist outlook by attending to multiple differences and women's agency within structures or systems that shape women and that women shape.

13) The extent to which the work of an academic feminist exhibits a collectivist outlook, an individualist outlook or one that stresses the tensions between a collectivist and individualist outlook is related to the theoretical perspective or specific mixing of perspectives that influence her in a positive way.

References¹

- Abu-Lughod, L. (ed.) (1998) *Remaking Women: Feminism and Modernity in the Middle East* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Adam, A. (1998) *Artificial Knowing: Gender and the Thinking Machine* London: Routledge.
- Adams, C. & Laurikietis, R. (1980) *The Gender Trap: A Closer Look at Sex Roles, Book Three: Messages and Images (revised edition)* London: Virago.
- Adkins, L. & Leonard, D. (1996) "Reconstructing French Feminism: Commodification, Materialism and Sex" in Leonard, D. & Adkins, L. (eds) *Sex in Question: French materialist feminism* London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (eds) (1993) *Feminist Epistemologies* London: Routledge.
- Allen, A.T. (1996) "The March through the Institutions: Women's Studies in the United States and West and East Germany, 1980-1995" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.22 no.1 pp.152-180.
- Allen, J.A. & Kitch, S.L. (1998) "Disciplined by the Disciplines? The Need for an Interdisciplinary Research Programme in Women's Studies" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.275-299.
- Allen, S. (1980) "Perhaps a Seventh Person?" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.325-339.
- Allen, S.G. & Hubbs, J. (1980) "Outrunning Atlanta: Feminine Destiny in Alchemical Transmutation" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.210-221.
- Allwood, G. (1998) *French Feminisms: Gender and Violence in Contemporary Theory* London: UCL.
- Althusser, L. (1984) "Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards and Investigation)" in Althusser, L. *Essays on Ideology* London: Verso.
- Andrew, A. & Montague, J. (1998) "Women's Friendship at Work" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.355-361.
- Anthony, B.M. (1980) "Parallels, Particularities, Problems and Positive Possibilities Related to Institutional Sexism and Racism" *Women's International Studies Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.339-346.
- Archer, M. (1998) "Realism and Morphogenesis" in Archer, M. Bhaskar, R. Collier, A. Lawson, T. & Norrie, A. (eds) *Critical Realism* London: Routledge.
- Atkinson, K (ed.) (1993) "Language and Gender" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Attwood, F. (1998) "Wierd Lullaby: Jane Campion's *The Piano*" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.85-101.
- Baehr, H. (1980) "The 'Liberated Woman' in Television Drama" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.29-40.
- Baker, S.W. (1980) "Biological Influences on Human Sex and Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.6, no.1, pp.80-96.
- Barrett, M. (1980) *Women's Oppression Today: Problems in Marxist Feminist Analysis* London: Verso.
- _____ (1991) *The Politics of Truth: From Marx to Foucault* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____ (1992) "Words and Things: Materialism and Method in Contemporary Feminist Analysis" in Barrett, M. & Phillips, A. (1992) *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Barrett, M. & Phillips, A. (1992) "Introduction" in Barrett, M. & Phillips, A. (eds) *Destabilizing Theory: Contemporary Feminist Debates* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Barwell, I. (1994) "Towards a Defence of Objectivity" in Lennon, K & Whitford, M. (eds) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* London: Routledge.
- Bauman, Z. (1987) *Legislators and Interpreters* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- _____ (1991) *Modernity and Ambivalence* Cambridge: Polity Press.

¹ Includes sample texts listed in Appendices I-IV. Texts rejected from the sample listed in Appendices V and VI only appear if they have been referenced in the main body of the thesis.

- _____ (1992) *Intimations of Postmodernity* London: Routledge.
- Beetham, M. (1998) "The Reinvention of the English Domestic Woman: Class and 'Race' in the 1980s Woman's Magazine" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.223-233.
- Beneria, L. (1998) "In the Wilderness of One's Inner Self: Living Feminism" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Benjamin, J. (1980) "The Bonds of Love: Rational Violence and Erotic Domination" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.144-174.
- Bhaskar, R. (1989) *Reclaiming Reality* London: Verso.
- Bhavnani, K. (1993) "Talking Racism and the Editing of Women's Studies" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Bhopal, K. (1998) "South Asian Women in East London: Motherhood and Social Support" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.485-492.
- Bing-Canar, J. & Zerkel, M. (1998) "Reading the Media and Myself: Experiences in Critical Media Literacy with Young Arab-American Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society Special Issue on Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.735-743.
- Bird, E. (2001) "Disciplining the Interdisciplinary: radicalism and the academic curriculum" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.22 no.4. pp.463-478.
- _____ (2002) "The Academic Arm of the Women's Liberation Movement: Women's Studies 1969-1999 in North America and the United Kingdom" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.25 no.1 pp.139-149.
- _____ (2003) "Women's Studies and the Women's Movement in Britain: origins and evolution, 1970-2000" *Women's History Review* vol.12 no.2 pp.263-288.
- Birke, L., Faulkner, W., Best, S., Janson-Smith, D. & Overfield, K. (eds) (1980) *Alice Through the Microscope: The Power of Science over Women's Lives* London: Virago.
- Birke, L. & Whitworth, R. (1998) "Seeking Knowledge: Women, Science and Islam" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.147-159.
- Blaubergs, M.S. (1980) "An Analysis of Classic Arguments Against Changing Sexist Language" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.135-148.
- Bond, M. & Bywaters, P. (1998) "Working it out for Ourselves: Women Learning about Hormone Replacement Therapy" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.65-76.
- Booth, J. (1980) "Watching the Family" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.15-28.
- Booth, K.M. (1998) "National Mother, Global Whore, and Transnational Femocrats: The Politics of AIDS and the Construction of Women at the World Health Organization" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.115-139.
- Bordo, S. (1993) *Unbearable Weight: feminism western culture and the body* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Boris, E. (1998) "Scholarship and Activism: The Case of Welfare Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.27-31.
- Bouchier, D. (1983) *The Feminist Challenge: The Movement for Women's Liberation in Britain and the United States* London: MacMillan Press.
- Bowen, A. (1998) "Testifying: My Experience in Women's Studies Doctoral Training at Clark University" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.374-386.
- Boxer, M.J. (1998a) "Remapping the University: The Promise of the Women's Studies Ph.D." *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.387-402.
- _____ (1998b) *When Women Ask the Questions: Creating Women's Studies in America* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press Ltd.
- Bradley, H. (1996) *Fractured Identities: Changing Patterns of Inequality* Cambridge: Polity Press.

- Braidotti, R. & Butler, J. (1994) "Feminism By Any Other Name: Interview" *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies, Special Issue on More Gender Trouble: Feminism Meets Queer Theory* vol. 6, no.2/3 pp.27-61.
- Brayboy, M.E. & Morgan, M.Y. (1998) "Voices of Indianness: The Lived World of Native American Women" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.341-354.
- Breitenbach, E., Brown, A. & Myers, F. (1998) "Understanding Women in Scotland" *Feminist Review* 58, pp.44-65.
- British Library (1979, 1980, 1981, 1982, 1983, 1997, 1998, 1999) *The British National Bibliography* London: The British Library.
- Brittain, V. (1980) *Testament of Experience: An Autobiographical Story of the Years 1925-1950* London: Virago.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975) *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape* London: Secker & Warburg.
- Bruner, E.M. & Kelso, J.P. (1980) "Gender Differences in Graffiti: A Semiotic Perspective" *Women's International Studies Quarterly Special Issue on The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.239-252.
- Bryan, B., Dadzie, S. & Scafe, S. (1997) "The heart of the race: Black women's lives in Britain" in Mirza H. S. (ed.) *Black British Feminism: A Reader* London Routledge.
- Bryson, V. (1992) *Feminist Political Theory: An Introduction* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Buhle, M.J. (1980) in Dubois, E. Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T. Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- Burke, C. (1980) "Introduction to Luce Irigaray's 'When Our Lips Speak Together'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.6, no.1, pp.66-68.
- Burr, V. (1995) *An Introduction to Social Constructionism* London: Routledge.
- Bush, J. (1998) "Edwardian Ladies and the 'Race' Dimensions of British Imperialism" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.277-289.
- Butler, J. (1986) "Desire and recognition in Satre's 'Saint Genet' and 'The Family Idiot'" *International Philosophical Quarterly* vol.26, no.4 pp.359-374.
- _____ (1990) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1987) *Subjects of Desire: Hegelian Reflection in Twentieth Century France* New York: Columbia University Press.
- _____ (1993) *Bodies that Matter: on the discursive limits of 'sex'* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1995a) "Contingent Foundations" in Benhabib, S. Butler, J. Cornell, D. & Fraser, N. *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange (Introduced by Linda Nicholson)* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1995b) "For a Careful Reading" in Benhabib, S. Butler, J. Cornell, D. & Fraser, N. *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange (Introduced by Linda Nicholson)* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1997) *The Psychic Life of Power: Theories in Subjection* Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Butler, M. & Paisley, W. (1980) *Women and the Mass Media: Sourcebook for Research and Action* New York: Human Sciences Press.
- Byrne, E. (1978) *Women and Education* London: Tavistock.
- Caesar, A. (1980) "Italian Feminism and the Novel: Sibilla Alermo's *A Woman*" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.79-87.
- Calhoun, C. (1994) *Nationalism and Civil Society: Democracy, Diversity and Self-Determination* in Calhoun, C. (ed.) *Social Theory and the Politics of Identity* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Campbell, B. (1980) "A Feminist Sexual Politics: now you see it now you don't" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.1-18.
- Cantarow, E. (1980) *Moving the Mountain: Women Working for Social Change* Old Westbury: Feminist Press..

- Carroll, B.A. (1980) "Political Science, Part II: International Politics, Comparative Politics, and Feminist Radicals" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.449-458.
- Carter, M. (1998) "The Politics of Pleasure: Cross-Cultural Autobiographic Performance in the Video Works of Sadie Benning" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.745-769.
- Chafe, W. H. (1981) *Civilities and Civil Rights: Greensboro, North Carolina and the Black Struggle for Freedom* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Chalmers, A. F. (1982) *What is this thing called Science?* (second edition) Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Chancer, L. S. (1998) *Reconcilable Differences: Confronting Beauty, Pornography, and the Future of Feminism* Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Chant, S. H. & McIlwaine, C. (1998) *Three Generations, Two Genders, One World: Women and Men in a Changing Century* London: Zed Books.
- Charles, N. & Hintjens, H. (eds) (1998) *Gender, Ethnicity, and Political Ideologies* London: Routledge.
- Chedgzoy, K., Hansen, M. & Trill, S. (eds) (1998) *Voicing Women: Gender and Sexuality in Early Modern Writing* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Christian-Smith, L.K. & Kellor, K.S. (eds) (1999) *Everyday Knowledge and Uncommon Truths: Women of the Academy* Boulder: Westview Press.
- Clawson, M.A. (1980) "Early Modern Fraternalism and the Patriarchal Family" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.368-391.
- Clough, P.T. (1994) *Feminist Thought: Desire, Power, and Academic Discourse* Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Codd, H. (1998) "Older Women, Criminal Justice and Women's Studies" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.183-192.
- Collins, L.H., Chrisler, J. C. & Quina, K (eds) (1998) *Arming Athena: Career Strategies for Women in Academe* London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Collins, P.H. (1991) *Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness and the Politics of Empowerment* New York: Routledge.
- Commission of the European Communities (CEC) (1984) *Women's Studies Supplement no.18 to Women of Europe* Brussels: CEC.
- Cook, B.W. "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.511-516.
- Coote, A. & Campbell, B. (1982) *Sweet Freedom: The Struggle for Women's Liberation* Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Coryell, J.L., Swain, M.H., Treadway, S.G. & Turner, E.H. (eds) (1998) *Beyond Image and Convention: Explorations in Southern Women's History* Columbia: University of Missouri Press.
- Cosslett, T., Easton, A. & Summerfield, P (eds) (1996) *Women, Power and Resistance: An Introduction to Women's Studies* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Cousins, J. (1980) "Comment on EOC's Recommendation to Repeal Protective Laws Limiting Women's Hours of Work" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.12-14.
- Coward, R. (1980) "'This Novel Changes Lives': Are Women's Novels Feminist Novels? A Response to Rebecca O'Rourke's 'Summer Reading'" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.53-64.
- Coyle, A. (1980) "The Protection Racket" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.1-12.
- Crompton, R. (1997) *Women and Work in Modern Britain* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crompton, R. & Sanderson, K. (1990) *Gendered Jobs and Social Change* London: Unwin & Hyman.
- Crossley, M.L. (1998) Women Living with a Long-Term HIV Positive Diagnosis: Problems, Concerns and Ways of Ascribing Meaning" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.521-533.
- Dall, C.W.H. (1980) *'Alongside'* New York: Arno Press.
- Dalla Costa, M. & James, S (1972) "Women and the Subversion of the Community" in Dalla Costa, M. & James, S. *The Power of Women and the Subversion of the Community* Bristol: Falling Water Press reprinted in Hennessy, R & Ingraham, C (eds) (1997) *Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives* London: Routledge.

- Dalton, P. (1980) "Feminist Art Practice and the Mass Media: A 'Personal' Account" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on Women and Media vol.3, no.1, pp.55-58.
- Daly, M. (1998) *Quintessence - Realizing the Archaic Future: a Radical Elemental Feminist Manifesto* Boston: Beacon Press.
- Davies, C. & Holloway, P. (1995) "Troubling Transformations: Gender Regimes and Organisational Culture in the Academy" in Morley, L. & Walsh, V. (eds) *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change* London: Taylor & Francis.
- Davis, R.E. (1998) "Discovering 'Creative Essences' in African America Women: The Construction of Meaning Around Inner Resources" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.493-504.
- de Groot, J. (1997). "After the Ivory Tower: Gender, commodification and the 'academic'" *Feminist Review* no.55 Spring pp.130-142.
- de Groot, J. & Maynard, M. (1993) *Facing the 1990s: Problems and Possibilities for Women's Studies* in de Groot, J. & Maynard, M. (eds) *Women's Studies in the 1990s: Doing Things Differently?* Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.
- Deem, R. (1978) *Women and Schooling* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1996a) "Border Territories: a journey through sociology, education and women's studies" *British Journal of Sociology of Education* vol.17 no.1 pp.5-19.
- _____ (1996b) "The gendering of educational organizations" in Cosslett, T., Easton, A. & Summerfield, P (eds) *Women, Power and Resistance: An Introduction to Women's Studies* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Delanty, G. (1997) *Social Science: Beyond Constructivism and Realism* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Delphy, C. (1975) "For a Materialist Feminism" originally published in *L'Arc*, 61, English tr. Mary Jo Lakeland & Susan Ellis Wolf in *Feminist Issues* 1, no.2 (Winter, 1981) reprinted in Hennessy, R & Ingraham, C (eds) (1997) *Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Class, Difference, and Women's Lives* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1980) "A Materialist Feminism Is Possible" (translated by Diana Leonard) *Feminist Review* no.4 pp.79-105.
- Dhaliwal, S. (1998) "Silent Contributors: Asian Female Entrepreneurs and Women in Business" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.463-474.
- di Leonardo, M. (1998) *Exotics At Home: Anthropologies, Others, American Modernity* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Diamond, I. (1980) "Pomography and Repression: A Reconsideration" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.686-701.
- Diehl, J.F. (1980) "'Cartographies of Silence': Rich's Common Language and the Woman Poet" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.530-546.
- Diggs, N.B. (1998) *Steel Butterflies: Japanese Women and the American Experience* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Dijkstra, S. (1980) "Simone de Beauvoir and Betty Friedan: The Politics of Omission" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.290-303.
- Doan, L. (1998) "Passing Fashions: Reading Female Masculinities in the 1920s" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.663-700.
- Dodds, D. (1998) "Five Years After Unification: East German Women in Transition" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.175-182.
- Doy, G. (1998) "More than Meets the Eye...Representations of Black Women in Mid-Nineteenth Century French Photography" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity vol.21, no.3, pp.305-319.
- Doyal, L. (ed.) (1998) *Women and Health Services: An Agenda For Change* Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Dubois, E. (1978) *Feminism and Suffrage: The Emergence of an Independent Women's Movement in America* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- _____ (1980) in Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.

- Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- Duelli Klein, R. (1983) "A Brief Overview of the Development of Women's Studies in the UK" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol. 6 no. 3 pp.255-260.
- Dunn, J. (1984) *Locke* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Dunne, G.A. (2000) 'Opting into Motherhood - Lesbians blurring the boundaries and transforming the meaning of parenthood and kinship' *Gender & Society* vol.14 no.1 pp.11-35.
- DuPlessis, R & Snitow, A. (1998a) "A Feminist Memoir Project" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- _____ (1998b) "Chronology" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Dye, N.S. (1980) "History of Childbirth in America" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no. 1, pp.97-108.
- Ebert, T.L. (1993). "Ludic Feminism, the Body, Performance, and Labor: Bringing Materialism Back into Feminist Cultural Studies". *Cultural Critique*, vol.23, Winter. pp. 5-50.
- _____ (1996) *Ludic Feminism and After: Postmodernism, Desire, and Labor in Late Capitalism* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Eddings, B.M. (1980) "Women in Broadcasting: *De Jure De Facto*" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on Women and Media vol.3, no.1, pp.1-14.
- Eisenstein, H. & Jardine, A. (eds) (1980) *The Future of Difference* New York: Bernard College Women's Center.
- Eisenstein, Z. (ed.) (1979) *Capitalist Patriarchy and the Case for Socialist Feminism* New York: Monthly Review Press.
- _____ (1981) "Reform and/or Revolution: Towards a Unified Women's Movement" in Sargent, L. (ed.) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy* London: Pluto Press.
- Eisler, R. & Hixon A. C. (1986) "The Equal Rights Amendment: What Is It, Why Do We Need It, and Why Don't We Have It Yet" in the National Women's Conference Center *The ERA Facts and Action Guide* reprinted in Ruth, S. (1998) *Issues in Feminism: An introduction to Women's Studies (Fourth Edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Engle, M. (1980) "Family Influences on the Language Development of Young Children" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.259-266.
- Epstein, D. & Steinberg, D.L. (1998) "American Dreamin': Discoursing Liberally on the Oprah Winfrey Show" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.77-94.
- Esquibel, C.R. (1998) "Memories of Girlhood: Chicana Lesbian Fictions" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.645-682.
- Ettorre, B. (1980) "Sappho Revisited: A New Look at Lesbianism" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.415-428.
- Ettorre, E. (2002) *Reproductive Genetics, Gender and the Body* London: Routledge.
- Evans, J. (1995) *Feminist Theory Today: An Introduction to Second-Wave Feminism* London: Sage Publications.
- Evans, M. (1980a) "Views of Women and Men in the Work of Simone de Beauvoir" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.395-404.
- Evans, S. (1980b) *Personal Politics: The Roots of Women's Liberation in the Civil Rights Movement and the New Left* New York: Vintage Books.
- Faber, D. (1980) *The Life of Lorena Hickok: ER's Friend* New York: Morrow.
- Faludi, S. (1991) *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* New York: Crown Publishers Inc.
- Faulkner, S. & Jackson, S. (eds) (1993) "Marriage and Motherhood" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Fay, E. (1998) *A Feminist Introduction to Romanticism* Malden: Blackwell.

- Fehrenbach, H. (1998) "Rehabilitating Fatherland: Race and German Remasculinization" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.107-127.
- Feldhaus, A. (ed.) (1998) *Images of Women in Maharashtrian Society* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Felstiner, M.L. (1980) "Seeing *The Second Sex* Through the Second Wave" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.247-276.
- Feminist Periodicals: A Current Listing of Contents* (1981, 1998, 1999) Vols. 1, 17, 18
- Ferri, B.A. & Gregg, Noel. (1998) "Women with Disabilities: Missing Voices" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.429-439.
- Finch, J. (1996) "Women, 'the' family and families" in Cosslett, T., Easton, A. & Summerfield, P (eds) *Women, Power and Resistance: An Introduction to Women's Studies* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Firestone, S. (1970) *The Dialectic of Sex: The Case for Feminist Revolution* New York: Bantam Books.
- Flax, J. (1990) *Thinking Fragments: Psychoanalysis, Feminism, and Postmodernism in the Contemporary World* London: University of California Press.
- Fleischman, S. (1998) "Gender, the Personal, and Discourse: A Review Essay" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.975-1016.
- Fletcher, S. (1980) *Feminists and Bureaucrats: A Study in the Development of Girls' Education in the Nineteenth Century* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flora, C.B. (1980) "Women in Latin American Fotonovelas: From Cinderella to Mata Hari" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.95-104.
- Foster, S.L. (1998) "Choreographies of Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.1-34.
- Fox, M.F. (1998) "Women in Science and Engineering: Theory, Practice, and Policy in Programs" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.201-223.
- Fox-Genovese, E. (1996) *"Feminism Is Not the Story of My Life": How Today's Feminist Elite Has Lost Touch with the Real Concerns of Women* New York: Doubleday.
- Foxhall, L. & Salmon, J. (eds) (1998) *When Men Were Men: masculinity, power, and identity in classical antiquity* London: Routledge.
- Fraser, N. (1995) "Pragmatism, Feminism, and the Linguistic Turn" in Benhabib, S., Butler, J., Cornell, D. & Fraser, N. *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange (Introduced by Linda Nicholson)* London: Routledge.
- Freeman, H. & Jones, A. (1980) "For Women Only?" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.429-440.
- Freeman, J. (1998) "On The Origins of the Women's Liberation Movement from a Strictly Personal Perspective" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Friday, N. (1980) *Men's Sexual Fantasies: The Triumph of Love Over Rage* New York: Delacorte Press.
- Friedan, B. (1963) *The Feminine Mystique* New York: Dell.
- Friedman, S.S. (1998) "(Inter)Disciplinarity and the Question of the Woman's Studies Ph.D." *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.301-325.
- Frith, G. (1993) "Women, Writing and Language: Making the Silences Speak" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Fuchs, J.P. (1980) "Female Eroticism in *The Second Sex*" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.304-313.
- Futas, E. (1980) "Communication and Information Patterns in the Emerging, Interdisciplinary Area of Women's Studies" Ph.D. diss. Rutgers University cited in Westbrook, L (1999) *Interdisciplinary Information Seeking in Women's Studies* Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc, Publishers.
- Gallop, J. (1988) *Thinking through the Body* New York: Columbia University Press.
- Gerhard, K. H. (ed.) (1998) *Women's Studies Serials: A Quarter Century of Development* London: The Haworth Press, Inc.

- German, L. (1989) *Sex, Class and Socialism* Bookmarks reprinted in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) (1993) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Ghoussoub, M. (1998) *Leaving Beirut: Women and the Wars Within* London: Saqi Books.
- Gibbs, N. (1993) "'Til Death Do Us Part" *Time* vol.141, no.3, January 18 reprinted in Ruth, S. (1998) *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies (Fourth Edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Gidlow, E. (1980) "Memoirs" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.107-127.
- Gillmartin, P. & Brunn, S. (1998) "The Representation of Women in Political Cartoons of the 1995 World Conference on Women" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.535-549.
- Gimenez, M. E. (2000) "What's material about materialist feminism?" *Radical Philosophy* May-June, no.101 pp.18-28.
- Glazer, N. (1980) "Overworking the Working Woman: The Double Day in a Mass Magazine" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.79-94.
- Glenn, E.N. (1980) "The Dialectics of Wage Work: Japanese-American Women and Domestic Service, 1905-1940" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.432-471.
- Goldman, H. (1994) "From Social Theory to Sociology of Knowledge and Back: Karl Mannheim and The Sociology of Intellectual Knowledge Production" *Sociological Theory* vol.12, no.3 pp.266-278.
- Goodman, M. (1980) "Toward a Biology of Menopause" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.5, no.4, pp.739-753.
- Gordon, B. & Kay, K. (1980) "Report on Feminist Film Event: 1979 Feminism and Cinema Event Edinburgh International Film Festival" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.121-122.
- Gould, M. (1980) "The New Sociology" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.459-467.
- Green, R. (1980) "Native American Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.248-267.
- Grief, E.B. (1980) "Sex Differences in Parent-Child Conversations" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.253-258.
- Griffin, S. (1979) "Politics: 1971" in *Rape: The Power of Consciousness* Harper Collins Publishers Inc. reprinted in Ruth, S. (1998) *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies (Fourth Edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Guy-Sheftall, B. (1995) *Women's Studies - A Retrospective: A Report to the Ford Foundation* New York: Ford Foundation.
- _____ (1998a) "Engaging Difference: Racial and Global Perspectives in Graduate Women's Studies Education" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.327-332.
- _____ (1998b) "Sisters in Struggle: A Belated Response" DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Hague, G. (1998) "Interagency Work and Domestic Violence in the UK" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.441-449.
- Hahner, J.E. (ed.) (1998) *Women Through Women's Eyes: Latin American Women in Nineteenth-Century Travel Accounts* Wilmington: SR Books.
- Halberg, M. (1989) "Feminist Epistemology" *Radical Philosophy* 53, pp.3-7.
- Halford, S. Kankeen, J. Russell, L. & Smith, K. (1997) "Introduction" *Women Making a Difference: a directory for change 1997/1998*.
- Hall, C. (1990) "Interview" in Wandor, M. (1990) *Once a Feminist: Stories of a Generation (interviews by Michelene Wandor)* London: Virago.
- Hall, M. (1989) "Private experiences in the public domain: lesbians in organizations" in Hearn, J. et al (eds) *The Sexuality of Organizations* London: Sage Publications Ltd. reprinted in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) (1993) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

- Hall, S. & Jaques, M. (eds) (1989) *New Times: The Changing Face of Politics in the 1990s* London: Lawrence & Wishart.
- Hamilton, P. (1974) *Knowledge and Social Structure: An introduction to the classical argument in the sociology of knowledge* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Hanmer, J. (1993) "Women and Reproduction" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hannam, J. (1993) "Women, History and Protest" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Hardill, I. & MacDonald, S. (1998) "Choosing to Relocate: An Examination of the Impact of Expatriate Work on Dual-Careers Households" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.21-29.
- Harding, S. (1986) *The Science Question in Feminism* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- _____ (1987a) "Conclusion: Epistemological Questions" in Harding, S. (ed.) *Feminism and Methodology* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- _____ (1987b) "Introduction: Is There a Feminist Method?" in Harding, S. (ed.) *Feminism and Methodology* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- _____ (1991) *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge? Thinking From Women's Lives* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- _____ (1993) "Rethinking Standpoint Epistemology: 'What Is Strong Objectivity?'" in Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (eds) *Feminist Epistemologies* London: Routledge.
- Harms, J. B. (1984) "Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge and the Interpretation of *Weltanschauungen*" *Social Science Journal* vol.21, no.2, 33-48.
- Hartmann, H. (1979) (1981) "The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: Towards a More Progressive Union" in Sargent, L. (ed.) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy* London: Pluto Press.
- Hartsock, N. (1983) "The Feminist Standpoint: Developing the Ground for a Specifically Feminist Historical Materialism" in Harding, S. & Hintikka (eds) *Discovering Reality: Feminist Perspectives on Epistemology, Metaphysics, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science* London: D. Reidel Publishing Company.
- _____ (1985) *Money, Sex and Power: Toward a Feminist Historical Materialism* Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Hausman, B.L. (1998) "Sex Before Gender: Charlotte Perkins Gilman and the Evolutionary Paradigm of Utopia" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.489-510.
- Haw, K. (1998) *Educating Muslim Girls: Shifting Discourses* Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Hawkesworth, M. E. (1989) "Knowers, Knowing, Known: Feminist Theory and Claims of Truth" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.14, no.3, pp.533-557.
- Hegland, M.E. (1998) "The Power of Paradox in Muslim Women's *Majales*: North-West Pakistani Mourning Rituals as Sites of Contestation over Religious Politics, Ethnicity, and Gender" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.391-428.
- Hekman, S.J. (1986) *Hermeneutics and the Sociology of Knowledge* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hemmings, C. (2005) "Telling feminist stories" *Feminist Theory* vol.6, no.2, pp.115-139.
- Hennessy, R. (1993) *Materialist feminism and the politics of discourse* London: Routledge.
- _____ (1995) "Incorporating Queer Theory on the Left" in Calliari, A., Cullenberg, S. & Biewener, C. (eds) *Marxism in the Postmodern Age: Confronting the New World Order* London: The Guildford Press.
- Hennessy, R. & Ingraham, C. (eds) (1997) *Materialist Feminism: A Reader in Difference, and Women's Lives* London: Routledge.
- Hershatter, G., Honig, E., Mann, S. & Rofel, L. (eds) (1998) *Guide to Women's Studies in China* Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, Berkeley, Center for Chinese Studies.
- Himmelweit, S. (1980) "Abortion: Individual Choice and Social Control" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.65-68.
- Hoagland, S.L. (1980) "Androcentric Rhetoric in Sociobiology" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.285-294.

- Hockey, J. (1993) "Women and Health" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- hooks, b. (1981) *Ain't I A Woman: Black Women and Feminism* London: Pluto Press.
- Hucklesby, A. (ed.) (1993) "Women, Crime and Deviance" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Hull, G.T. (1980) "Researching Alice Dunbar-Nelson: A Personal and Literary Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.314-320.
- Humm, M. (ed.) (1992) *Feminisms: A Reader* Hemel Hempstead: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Humphries, J. (1980) "The Socio-Economic Determinants of Recourse to Legal Abortion" *Women's International Studies Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.377-394.
- Hurley, S.L. (1998) "Out of India: The Journeys of the Begam of Bophal, 1901-1930" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.263-276.
- Irigaray, L. (1980) "When Our Lips Speak Together" (translated by Carolyn Burke) *Signs* vol.6 no.1 pp.69-79.
- Jackson, S. (1993a) "Women and the Family" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- _____ (ed.) (1993b) "Sexuality" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- _____ (1995) "Gender and Heterosexuality: A Materialist Feminist Analysis" in Maynard, M. & Purvis, J. (eds) *(Hetero)Sexual Politics* London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- _____ (1996) *Christine Delphy* London: Sage Publications.
- _____ (1998) "Feminist Social Theory" in Jackson, S. & Jones, J. (eds) *Contemporary Feminist Theories* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- _____ (1999a) *Heterosexuality in Question* London: Sage.
- _____ (2001) "Why a Materialist Feminism in (Still) Possible - and Necessary" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.24, no.3/4, pp.283-293.
- Jackson, S., Atkinson, K., Beddoe, D., Brewer, T., Faulkner, S., Hucklesby, A., Pearson, R., Power, H., Prince, J., Ryan, M. & Young, P. (eds) (1993a) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Jackson, S., Prince, J. & Young, P. (eds) (1993b) "Science, Medicine and Reproductive Technology" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Jackson, S. (1999b) "Towards 2000: Women's Studies in the U.K." *Women's Studies Network Newsletter* no.33.
- _____ (2000) "Networking Women: A History of Ideas, Issues and Development in Women's Studies in Britain" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.23 no.1 pp.1-11.
- Jaggar, A.M. (1983) *Feminist Politics and Human Nature* Totowa: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers Inc.
- Jaggar, A.M. & Bordo, S. (eds) (1989) *Gender/Body/Knowledge: Feminist Reconstructions of Being and Knowing* New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- James, S.M. (1998) "Shades of Othering: Reflections on Female Circumcision/ Genital Mutilation" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.1031-1048.
- Janeway, E. (1980) "Who Is Sylvia? On the Loss of Sexual Paradigms" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.573-589.
- Jeffords, S. (1998) "The 'Remasculinization of Germany in the 1950s: Discussion" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.163-169.
- Jenefsky, C. & Miller, D.H. (1998) "Phallic Intrusion: Girl-Girl Sex in *Penthouse*" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.375-385.
- Jones, J. (1992) "Publishing feminist criticism: academic book publishing and the construction and circulation of feminist knowledges" *Critical Survey* vol.4 no.2 pp.174-182.
- Jong, E. (1998) *what do Women want?: Bread, Roses, Sex, Power* New York: HarperCollins Publishers.

- Joseph, S. (1998) "Comment on Majid's 'The Politics of Feminism in Islam': Critique of Politics and the Politics of Critique" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.363-369.
- Joseph, T.B. (1980) "Poetry as a Strategy of Power: The Case of Riffian Berber Women" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.418-434.
- Kaiser, D. (1998) "A Mannheim for All Seasons: Bloor, Merton, and the Roots of the Sociology of Scientific Knowledge" *Science in Context* vol.11, no.1, pp.51-87.
- Kampwirth, K. (1998) "Legislating Personal Politics in Sandanista Nicaragua, 1979-1992" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.53-64.
- Kaplan, T. (1980) in Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- Karpf, A. (1980) "Women and Radio" *Women's Studies International Quarterly Special Issue on Women and Media* vol.3, no.1, pp.41-54.
- Katz, E. & Rapone, A. (eds) (1980) *Women's Experience in America: An Historical Anthology* New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- Kauanui, J.K. (1998) "Off-Island Hawaiians 'Making' Ourselves at 'Home': A [Gendered] Contradiction in Terms?" *Women's Studies International Forum Special Issue on Migrating Feminisms: The Asia Pacific Region* vol.21, no.6, pp.681-693.
- Kaufmann, D. (1998) "The Story of Two Women: Dominique Aury and Edith Thomas" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.883-905.
- Kaluzynska, E. (1980) "Wiping the Floor With Theory - A Survey of Writings on Housework" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.27-54.
- Kecskemeti, P. (1952) "Introduction" in Mannheim, K. *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti)* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Kemp, S. & Squires, J. (eds) (1997) *Feminisms* Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Kenedy, L. & Lapidus, J. (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.571-581.
- Kennedy, M. & Piette, B. (1991) "From the Margins to the Mainstream: Issues around Women's Studies on Adult Education and Access Courses" in Aaron, J. & Walby, S. (eds) *Out of the Margins Women's Studies in the Nineties* London: The Falmer Press.
- Kerr, E.A. (1998) "Toward a Feminist Natural Science: Linking Theory and Practice" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.95-109.
- Kesselman, A., Booth, H., Rothstein, V. & Weisstein, N. (1998) "Our Gang of Four: Friendship and Women's Liberation" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Kettler, D., Meja, V. & Stehr, N. (1984) *Karl Mannheim* London: Tavistock Publications.
- Kittay, E.F. (1998) "Dependency, Equality, and Welfare" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.32-43.
- Kolodny, A. (1980) "Dancing Through the Minefields: Some Observations on the Theory, Practice and Politics of Feminist Literary Criticism" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.1-25.
- Kornbluh, F. (1998) "The Goals of the National Welfare Rights Movement: Why We Need Them Thirty Years Later" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.65-78.
- Kraemer, R.S. (1980) "The Conversion of Women to Ascetic Forms of Christianity" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.298-307.
- Kuo, L. (1998) "Secondary Discrimination as a Standard for feminist Social Policy: Norplant and Probation, a Case Study" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.907-944.
- Laclau, E. & Mouffe, C. (1985) *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* London: Verso.
- Ladimer, B. (1980) "Madness and the Irrational: A Feminist Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.175-195.
- Land, H. (1980) "The Family Wage" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.55-77.
- Landry, D. & MacLean, G. (1993) *Materialist Feminisms* Oxford: Blackwell Publishers

- Landsman, G.H. (1998) "Reconstructing Motherhood in the Age of 'Perfect' Babies: Mothers of Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.69-199.
- Lazarre, J. (1980a) "Loving Men: Two Aspects" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.212-217.
- _____ (1980b) *On Loving Men* New York: Dial Press.
- Leavitt, J.W. (1980) "Birthing and Anesthesia: The Debate over Twilight Sleep" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.147-148.
- Lederer, L. (ed.) (1980) *Take Back The Night: Women on Pornography* New York: Morrow.
- Leifer, M. (1980) "Pregnancy" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.754-765.
- Leman, J. (1980) "'The Advice of a Real Friend': Codes of Intimacy and Oppression in Women's Magazines 1937-1955" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on Women and Media vol.3, no.1, pp.63-78.
- Lemert, C. (1997) *Postmodernism Is not What You Think* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lennon, K. & Whitford, M. (eds) (1994) *Knowing the Difference: Feminist Perspectives in Epistemology* London: Routledge.
- Leonard, D. (1980a) *Sex and Generation: A Study of Courtship and Weddings* London: Tavistock.
- _____ (1980b) "m/f, Women's Studies International Quarterly and Feminist Review" *Resources For Feminist Research* vol.ix no.3 pp.56-58.
- Lerner, G. (1980) in Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- Levin, R. (1990) "Interview" in Wandor, M. (1990) *Once a Feminist: Stories of a Generation (interviews by Michelene Wandor)* London: Virago.
- Liddington, J. & Norris, J. (1978) *'One Hand Tied Behind Us' The Rise of the Women's Suffrage Movement* London: Virago.
- Lieberman, S.T. (1998) *The Mother and Narrative Politics in Modern China* Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia.
- Ling, H. (1998) *Surviving on the Gold Mountain: A History of Chinese American Women and Their Lives* Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Litman, G.K. (1980) "Women, Alcohol and Cultural Stereotyping: Updating the Myth" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.347-355.
- Longino, H. (1990) *Science as Social Knowledge: Values and Objectivity in Scientific Inquiry* Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- _____ (1993) "Subjects, Power and Knowledge: Description and Prescription in Feminist Philosophies of Science" in Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (eds) *Feminist Epistemologies* London: Routledge.
- Longmire, L. & Merrill, L. (eds) (1998) *Untying the Tongue: Gender, Power, and the Word* Westport: Greenwood Press.
- Lorber, J. (1998) *Gender Inequality: Feminist Theories and Politics* Los Angeles: Roxbury Publishing Company.
- Lovell, A. (1980) "Fresh Horizons: The Aspirations and Problems of Intending Women Mature Students" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.93-104.
- Lowry, S. (1980) *The Guilt Cage: Housewives and a Decade of Liberation* London: Elm Tree Books.
- M/f* (1980) no.4.
- Majid, A. (1998) "The Politics of Feminism in Islam" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23 no.2 pp.321-361
- Malos, E. (ed.) (1980) *The Politics of Housework* London: Allison & Busby.
- Mannheim, K. (1952a) "The Problem of a Sociology of Knowledge" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti)* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1952b) "The Problem of Generations" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti)* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

- _____ (1952c) "Competition as a Cultural Phenomenon" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge* (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1952d) "Historicism" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge* (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1952e) "The Nature of Economic Ambition and its Significance for the Social Education of Man" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge* (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1952f) "On the Interpretation of *Weltanschauung*" in *Essays on The Sociology of Knowledge* (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1953). "Conservative Thought" in *Essays on Sociology and Social Psychology* (edited and translated by Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1956) "The Problem of the Intelligentsia: An Inquiry into its Past and Present Role" in *Essays on The Sociology of Culture* (edited by Ernest Manheim in cooperation with Paul Kecskemeti) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- _____ (1968) *Ideology and Utopia: An Introduction to the Sociology of Knowledge* (with a Preface by Louis Wirth) London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Mansbridge, J. (1986) *Why We Lost the ERA* Chicago: University of Chicago Press
- Margolis, K. (1980) "The Long and Winding Roads (Reflections on *Beyond the Fragments*)" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.89-102.
- Marshment, M. (1993) "The Picture is Political: Representation of Women in Contemporary Popular Culture" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Martyna, W. (1980a) "Teaching About Language and the Sexes" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.295-304.
- _____ (1980b) "Beyond the He/Man Approach: The Case for Non-Sexist Language" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.482-493.
- Mayer, A.E. (1998) "Comment on Majid's 'The Politics of Feminism in Islam'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.369-277.
- Maynard, M. (1990) "The Re-Shaping of Sociology? Trends in the Study of Gender" *Sociology* vol.24 no.2 pp.269-290.
- _____ (1993) "Violence Towards Women" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- _____ (1995) "Beyond the 'Big Three': the development of feminist theory into the 1990s" *Women's History Review* Vol.4, No.3, pp.259-281.
- _____ (1998) "Women's Studies" in Jackson, S. & Jones, J. (ed.) *Contemporary Feminist Theories* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- McClure, K. (1992) "The Issue of Foundations: Scientized Politics, Politicized Science and Feminist Critical Practice" in Butler, J. & Scott, J. W. (eds) *Feminists Theorize the Political* London: Routledge.
- McDermott, P. (1994) *Politics and Scholarship: Feminist Academic Journals and the Production of Knowledge* Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
- _____ (1998) "The Meaning and Uses of Feminism in Introductory Women's Studies Textbooks" *Feminist Studies* Special Issue on *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.403-427.
- McGlynn, C. (ed.) (1998) *Legal Feminisms: theory and practice* Aldershot: Ashgate.
- McGrew, A. (1992) "A Global Society?" in Hall, S., Held, D. & McGrew, A. (eds) *Modernity and Its Futures* Cambridge: Polity Press.
- McLerran, J. (1998) "Disciplined Subjects and Docile Bodies in the Work of Contemporary Artist Jana Sterbak" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.535-552.
- McNeil, M. (1987) *Gender and Expertise* London: Free Association Books.
- Merton, R.K. (1967) *On Theoretical Sociology*. New York: The Free Press.
- _____ (1968) *Social Theory and Social Structure* London: The Free Press.
- Michel, S. (1998) "Childcare and Welfare (in)Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.44-54.

- Mies, M. & Shiva, V. (1993) *Ecofeminism* London: Zed Books.
- Miller, P.Y. & Fowlkes, M.R. (1980) "Social & Behavioral Constructions of Female Sexuality" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.783-800.
- Millett, K. (1970) *Sexual Politics* New York: Ballantine Books.
- Mink, G. (1998) "The Lady and the Tramp (II): Feminist Welfare Politics, Poor Single Mothers, and the Challenge of Welfare Justice" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.55-64.
- Minnich, E.K. (1998) "Feminist Attacks on Feminisms: Patriarchy's {rpdigal Daughters" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.159-175.
- Mitchell, J. (1966) "Women: The Longest Revolution" *New Left Review* no.40.
- _____ (1986) *Woman's Estate (with a new afterword)* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Modleski, T. (1980) "The Disappearing Act: A Study of Harlequin Romances" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.435-448.
- Moi, T. & Radway, J. (1994) "Editor's Note" *The South Atlantic Quarterly, Special Issue on Materialist Feminism* Fall, vol.93, no.4 pp.749-750.
- Morely, L. (1999) *Organising Feminisms: The Micropolitics of the Academy* Basingstoke: MacMillan Press.
- Morley, L. & Walsh, V. (eds) (1995) *Feminist Academics: Creative Agents for Change* London: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Moses, C.G. (1998) "Made in America: 'French Feminism' in Academia" *Feminist Studies* Special Issue on *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.241-274.
- Myers, L.W. (1998) *Black Male Socialization: Revisited in the Minds of Respondents* Stamford: JAI Press.
- National Council for Research on Women (1996) "Affirmative Action: Building a National Community that Works" *Issues Quarterly* vol.1 no. 4 reprinted in Ruth. S. *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies (fourth edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Nava, M. (1980) "Gender and Education: A Discussion of Two Recent Books" *Feminist Review* 5, 69-78.
- Nelson, D.D. (1998) *National Manhood: Capitalist Citizenship and the Imagined Fraternity of White Men* Durham: Duke University Press.
- Nelson, L.H. (1993) "Epistemological Communities" in Alcoff, L. & Potter, E. (eds) *Feminist Epistemologies* London: Routledge.
- Nelson, M.K. & Smith, Joan, (1998) "Economic Restructuring, Household Strategies, and Gender: A Case Study of a Rural Community" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.79-114.
- Nelson, R.D. (1992) "The Sociology of Styles of Thought" *British Journal of Sociology* vol.43, no.1, pp.25-54.
- Nestle, J. (1998) "A Fem's Feminist History" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Newton, J. (1998) "White Guys" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.572-598.
- Nicholson, L. (ed.) (1997) *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* London: Routledge.
- Nicolson, P. (1993) "Motherhood and Women's Lives" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Oakley, A. (1998) "Science, Gender and Women's Liberation: An Argument Against Postmodernism" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.133-146.
- O'Brien, M. (1981) *The Politics of Reproduction* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul cited in Jackson, S. (1996) *Christine Delphy* London: Sage Publications.
- Office for National Statistics (ONS) (1998) *Social Trends 28* London: HMSO.
- O'Kelly, C.G. (1980) *Women and Men in Society* New York: D. Van Nostrand Co.
- Omalade, B (1998) "Sisterhood in Black and White" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.

- O'Neil, K. (1998) "No Adults Are Pulling The Strings and We Like It That Way" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.611-618.
- Oyewumi, O. (1998) "De-Confounding Gender: Feminist Theorizing and Western Culture, Comment on Hawkesworth's 'Confounding Gender'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.4, pp.1049-1062.
- Paczuska, A. (1980) *Sisters and Workers* London: Socialist Unlimited.
- Patai, D. & Koertge, N. (1994) *Professing Feminism: Cautionary Tales from the Strange World of Women's Studies* New York: HarperCollins.
- Pearson, R. (ed.) (1993) "Public/Private: women, politics and the state" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Person, E.S. (1980) "Sexuality as the Mainstay of Identity: Psychoanalytic Perspectives" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.5, no.4, pp.605-630.
- Petchesky, R.P. (1980) "Reproductive Freedom: Beyond 'A Woman's Right to Choose'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.5, no.4, pp.661-685.
- Phillips, A. & Taylor, B. (1980) "Sex and Skill: Notes Towards a Feminist Economics" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.79-88.
- Phillips, E. (1980) "Letter From Eileen Phillips: More on *Beyond The Fragments*" *Feminist Review*, 6, pp.108-110.
- Plowden, A. (1998) *Women All On Fire: The Women of the English Civil War* Stroud: Sutton Pub.
- Poiger, U.G. (1998) "A New 'Western' Hero? Reconstructing German Masculinity in the 1950s" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.147-162.
- Polier, N. (1998) "True Transgressions: Refusal and Recolonization in the Narrative of a Papuan Migrant 'Bighead'" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.3, pp.511-534.
- Pollert, A. (1996) "Gender and Class Revisited; or, The Poverty of Patriarchy" *Sociology* vol.30 no.4 pp.639-659.
- Poovey, M. (1995) "The Differences of Women's Studies: The Example of Literary Criticism" in Stanton, D.C. & Stewart, A.J. (eds) *Feminisms in the Academy* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Porter, M.A. (1998) "Resisting Uniformity at Mwana Kupona Girls' School: Cultural Reflections in an Educational Setting" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.619-643.
- Power, H. (ed.) (1993) "Women and the Law" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Powers, M. (1980) "Menstruation and Reproduction: An Ogala Case Study" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.6, no.1, pp.54-65.
- Prince, J. (ed.) (1993) "Women, Education and Work" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Projansky, S. (1998) "Girls Who Act Like Women Who Fly: Jessica Dubroff as Cultural Troublemaker" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.771-807.
- Prokhovnik, R. (1998) "Public and Private Citizenship: From Gender Invisibility to Feminist Inclusiveness" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.84-103.
- Prospects (1998) *Postgraduate Directory 98/99 student update* Manchester: CSU
- Pryce, M. (1999) *Defining Women's Studies Scholarship: A Statement of the NWSA Task Force on Faculty Roles and Rewards* NWSA www.nwsa.org/publications.htm.
- Raghuram, P. & Hardill, I. (1998) "Negotiating a Market: A Case Study of and Asian Woman in Business" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.5, pp.475-483.
- Rahman, M. & Witz, A. (2003) "What Really Matters? The elusive quality of the material in feminist thought" *Feminist Theory* vol.4 no.3 pp.243-261.
- Ramas, M. (1980) "Freud's Dora, Dora's Hysteria: The Negation of a Woman's Hysteria" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.3, pp.472-510.
- Rapp, R. (1980) "Introduction to Elsa Gidlow's *Memoirs*" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.103-106.

- Raymond, J.G. (1998) Prostitution as Violence Against Women: NGO Stonewalling in Beijing and Elsewhere" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.1-9.
- Reay, D. (1998) "Surviving in Dangerous Places: Working-Class Women, Women's Studies and Higher Education" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.11-19.
- Register, C. (1980) "Literary Criticism" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.268-282.
- Remmling, G.W. (1975) *The Sociology of Karl Mannheim: With a bibliographical guide to the sociology of knowledge, ideological analysis, and social planning* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Rich, A. (1978) *The Dream of a Common Language: Poems 1974-77* New York: W. W. Norton Co.
- (1980) "Compulsory Heterosexuality and Lesbian Existence" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.631-660.
- Richardson, D. (1993) "Sexuality and Male Dominance" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) (1993) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Ringer, F. (1990) "The intellectual Field, intellectual history, and the sociology of Knowledge" *Theory and Society* vol.19 pp.269-294.
- Roberts, C. (1998) *We Are Our Mothers' Daughters* New York: Morrow.
- Roberts, H. (ed.) (1992) *Doing Feminist Research* London: Routledge.
- Robinson, M. (1998) *A Letter to the Women of England on the Injustice of Mental Subordination* Poole: Woodstock Books.
- Robinson, V. (1993) "Introducing Women's Studies" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Rogers, L. (1998) *Feminine Nation: Performance, Gender, and Resistance in the Works of John McGahern and Neil Jordan* Lanham: University Press of America.
- Rohrlich, R. (1980) "State Formation in Sumer and the Subjugation of Women" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.76-102.
- Roiphe, K. (1993) *The Morning After: Sex, Fear, and Feminism on Campus* Boston: Little, Brown & Co.
- Rorty, R. (1989) *Contingency, irony and solidarity* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosaldo, M.Z. (1980) "The Use and Abuse of Anthropology: Reflections on Feminism and Cross-Cultural Understanding" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3.
- Rosenberg, J. & Garofalo, G. (1998) "Riot Grrrl: Revolutions from Within" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on Feminisms and Youth Cultures vol.23, no.3, pp.809-841.
- Roseneil, S. (1995) "The coming of age of feminist sociology: some issues of theory and practice" *British Journal of Sociology* vol.46 no.2 pp.191-205.
- Ross, E. (1980) "'The Love Crisis': Couples Advice Books in the Late 1970s" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.109-122.
- Rosser, S.V. (1998) "Applying Feminist Theories to Women in Science Programs" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.24, no.1, pp.171-200.
- Rossi, A.S. (1980) "Life-Span Theories and Women's Lives" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.4-32.
- Rothblum, E.D., Weinstock, J. S. & Morris, J. (eds) (1998) *Women in the Antarctic* New York: Harrington Park Press.
- Rottella, E.J. (1998) "Women and the American Economy" in Ruth. S. *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies (fourth edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Rowbotham, J. (1998) "'Hear and Indian Sister's Plea': Reporting the Work of Nineteenth Century Female Missionaries" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on Women, Imperialism and Identity vol.21, no.3, pp.247-261.

- Rowbotham, S. (1983) *Dreams and Dilemmas: Collected Writings* London: Virago.
- Rowbotham, S., Segal, L. & Wainwright, H. (1979) *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* London: The Merlin Press Ltd.
- Rubin, G. & Butler, J. (1994) "Sexual Traffic (Interview)" *Differences* vol.6, no.2-3, pp.62-99.
- Ruddick, S. (1980) "Maternal Thinking" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.342-367.
- Russell, D.H. (1980) "Art History" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.468-481.
- Ruth, S. (1998) *Issues in Feminism: An Introduction to Women's Studies (Fourth Edition)* London: Mayfield Publishing Company.
- Ryan, M. (ed.) (1993) "Representations of Women in the Media" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Safa-Isfahani, K. (1980) "Female-Centred World Views in Iranian Culture: Symbolic Representations of sexuality in 'Dramatic Games'" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.33-53.
- Salem, J.C. (1980) "On Naming the Oppressor: What Woolf Avoids Saying in *A Room of One's Own*" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.209-218.
- Sargent, L. (ed.) (1981) *The Unhappy Marriage of Marxism and Feminism: A Debate on Class and Patriarchy* London: Pluto Press.
- Scheler, M. (1980) *Problems of a Sociology of Knowledge* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Scott, K.P. (1980) "Perceptions of Communication Competence: What's Good for the Goose is not Good for the Gander" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.199-209.
- Shih, S. (1998) "Gender and A New Geopolitics of Desire: The Seduction of Mainland Women in Taiwan and Hong Kong Media" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* vol.23, no.2, pp.287-319.
- Shulman, A.K. (1980) "Sex and Power: Sexual Bases of Radical Feminism" " *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.590-604.
- Silvera, J. (1980) "Generaic Masculine Words and Thinking" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.165-178.
- Simonds, A. P. (1978) *Karl Mannheim's Sociology of Knowledge* Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Sked, A. & Cook, C. (1993) *Post-War Britain: A Political History (new edition 1945-1992)* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Skeggs, B. (1995) "Women's Studies in Britain in the 1990's: Entitlement Cultures and Institutional Constraints" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.18 no.4 pp.475-485.
- Skelton, C. (1993) "Women and Education" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Smith, D. E. (1988) *The Everyday World as Problematic: a Feminist Sociology* Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Smith-Rosenburg, C. (1980) in Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- Smyth, L. (1998) "Narratives of Irishness and the Problem of Abortion" *The X Case 1992*" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.61-83.
- Snitow, A.B. (1980) "The Front Line: Notes on Sex in Novels by Women, 1969-1979" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.5, no.4, pp.702-718.
- Soh, S.C. (1998) "Uncovering the Truth About the 'Comfort Women'" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.451-454.
- Sommers, C. H. (1994) *Who Stole Feminism? How Women Have Betrayed Women* New York: Simon & Schuster.

- Spence, J. (1998) "Women, Wives and the Campaign Against Pit Closures in County Durham: Understanding the Vane Tempest Vigil" *Feminist Review* 60, pp.33-60.
- Spender, D. (1992) "The gatekeepers: a feminist critique of academic publishing" in Roberts, H. (ed.) *Doing Feminist Research* London: Routledge.
- Stacey, J. (1993) "Untangling Feminist Theory" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* London: MacMillan Press.
- _____ (1997) "Feminist Theory: Capital F, Capital T" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies (second edition)* London: MacMillan Press.
- Stacey, J. (1995) "Disloyal to the Disciplines: A Feminist Trajectory in the Borderlands" in Stanton, D.C. & Stewart, A.J. (eds) *Feminisms in the Academy* Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Stacey, J. & Thorne, B. (1985) "The Missing Feminist Revolution in Sociology" *Social Problems* vol.32, no.4, pp.301-316.
- Stacey, M. & Price, M. (1980) "Women and Power" *Feminist Review* 5, pp.33-52.
- Stanley, L. (1990a) "Feminist praxis and the academic mode of production: an Editorial introduction" in Stanley, L. (ed.) *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology* London: Routledge.
- _____ (ed.) (1990b) *Feminist Praxis: Research, Theory and Epistemology in Feminist Sociology* London: Routledge.
- _____ (ed.) (1997) *Knowing Feminisms: On Academic Borders, Territories and Tribes* London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Stansell, C. (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.65-75.
- Stanton, D.C. & Stewart, A.J. (eds) (1995) *Feminisms in the Academy* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press
- Stanworth, M. (ed.) (1987) *Reproductive Technologies: Gender, Motherhood and Medicine* Cambridge: Polity.
- Stark, W. (1958) *The Sociology of Knowledge: An essay in aid of a deeper understanding of the history of ideas* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.
- Staudt, K. A. (1998) *Policy, Politics and Gender: Women Gaining Ground* West Hartford: Kumarian Press.
- Steedman, C. (1980) "'The Tidy House'" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.1-24.
- Stewart, A., Herman, A. & Smith, S. (1998) "The Joint Doctoral Program at the university of Michigan" *Feminist Studies Special Issue on Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.356-365.
- Stimpson, C.R. (1986) *Women's Studies In the United States: A Report to the Ford Foundation* New York: Ford Foundation.
- Stimpson, C.R., Burstyn, J.N. & Stanton, D.C. (1980) "Editorial" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on Women - Sex and Sexuality vol.6, no.1, pp.1-3.
- Strober, M. & Tyack, D. (1980) "Why do Women Teach and Men Manage? A Report on Research in Schools" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.494-503.
- Tammes, D. (1980) "Camerawoman Obscura: A 'Personal' Account" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on Women and Media vol.3, no.1, pp.59-62.
- Tax, M. (1998) "For the People Hear Us Singing, Bread and Roses! Bread and Roses" in DuPlessis, R. & Snitow, A. (eds) *The Feminist Memoir Project: Voices from Women's Liberation* New York: Three Rivers Press.
- Thane, P. (1982) *The Foundations of the Welfare State* London: Longman.
- Tidball, E.M. (1980) "Women's Colleges and Women Achievers Revisited" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.5, no.3, pp.504-517.
- Tong, R. (1989) *Feminist Thought: A Comprehensive Introduction* Boulder: Westview Press.
- Torr, R (1999) "Contemporary Academic Feminism in the U.K. and the USA 1980-1998: developing a comparative analysis" roundtable presentation, ASA Annual Meeting, Chicago, 6th-10th August.
- _____ (2000) "Contemporary Academic Feminism in Britain and North America: employing the insights of the sociology of knowledge" roundtable presentation, Knowing the Social World Conference, University of Salford, 5th-7th July.

- Torton Beck, E. (1990) "To Make of our Lives a Study: Feminist Education as Empowerment for Women" in Lie, S.S. & O'Leary, V.E. (eds) *Storming the Tower: Women in the Academic World* London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Tuana, N. & Tong, R. (eds) (1995) *Feminism & Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application* Oxford: Westview Press.
- Tuchman, G. & Fortin, N. (1980) "Edging Women Out: Some Suggestions about the Structure of Opportunities in the Victorian Novel" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.308-325.
- Tuson, P. (1998) "Mutiny Narratives and the Imperial Feminine: European Women's Accounts of the rebellion in India in 1857" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.291-303.
- Twells, A. (1998) "'Happy English Children': Class, Ethnicity and the Making of Missionary Women in the Early Nineteenth Century" *Women's Studies International Forum* Special Issue on *Women, Imperialism and Identity* vol.21, no.3, pp.235-245.
- Uchida, A. (1998) "The Orientalization of Asian Women in America" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.2, pp.161-174.
- Ulrich, L.T. (1980) "'A Friendly Neighbour': Social Dimensions of Daily Work in Northern Colonial New England" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.2, pp.302-405.
- Van Allen, J. (1980) "A Review Essay" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.224-229.
- Vance, C. (1980) "Gender Systems, Ideology and Sex Research: An Anthropological Analysis" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.129-143.
- Waddy, C. (1980) *Women in Muslim History* London: Longman.
- Wainwright, H. (1979) "Introduction" in Rowbotham, S., Segal, L. & Wainwright, H. (1979) *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* London: Merlin Press.
- Walby, S. (1989) "Theorizing Patriarchy" *Sociology* vol.23 no.2 pp.213-234.
- _____ (1990) *Theorizing Patriarchy* Oxford: Blackwell.
- _____ (1997) *Gender Transformations* London: Routledge.
- Wald, G. (1998) "Just a Girl? Rock Music, Feminism, and the Cultural Construction of Female Youth" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* Special Issue on *Feminisms and Youth Cultures* vol.23, no.3, pp.585-610.
- Walker, M.U. (1998) *Moral Understandings: A Feminist Study in Ethics* New York: Routledge.
- Walkowitz, J.R. (1980a) in Dubois, E., Buhle, M.J., Kaplan, T., Lerner, G. & Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1980) "Politics and Culture in Women's History: A Symposium (introduced by Judith R. Walkowitz)" *Feminist Studies* vol.6, no.1, pp.26-64.
- _____ (1980b) "The Politics of Prostitution" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.6, no.1, pp.123-135.
- Walters, A. (1980) "When Women's Reputations are in Male Hands: Elizabeth Gaskell and the Critics" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* vol.3, no.4, pp.405-414.
- Weedon, C. (1997) *Feminist Practice and Poststructuralist Theory* (second edition) Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Weinbaum, B. (1978) *The Curious Courtship of Women's Liberation and Socialism* Boston: South End Press.
- Weisskopf, S. (1980) "Maternal Sexuality and Asexual Motherhood" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* Special Issue on *Women - Sex and Sexuality* vol.5, no.4, pp.766-782.
- Westbrook, L. (1999) *Interdisciplinary Information Seeking in Women's Studies* Jefferson: McFarland & Company, Inc, Publishers.
- Whelehan, I. (1995) *Modern Feminist Thought: From the Second Wave to 'Post-Feminism'* Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Wilkinson, S. (1998) "Focus Groups in Feminist Research: Power, Interaction and the Co-Construction of Meaning" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.1, pp.111-125.
- Williams, M. (2000) *Science and Social Science: An Introduction* London: Routledge.
- Williams, M. & May, T. (1996) *Introduction to the Philosophy of the Social Research* London: UCL Press Ltd.

- Williams, R.M. & Peterson, C.L. (1998) "The Color of Memory: Interpreting Twentieth-Century US Social Policy from a Nineteenth-Century Perspective" *Feminist Studies* vol.24, no.1, pp.7-25.
- Wilson, E. (1980a) "Beyond The Ghetto: Thoughts on *Beyond the Fragments: Feminism and the Making of Socialism* by Sheila Rowbotham, Lynne Segal and Hilary Wainwright" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.28-44
- _____ (1980b) *Only Halfway to Paradise: Women in Postwar Britain, 1945-1968* London: Tavistock.
- Witz, A. (1993) "Women at Work" in Richardson, D. & Robinson, V. (eds) *Introducing Women's Studies* Houndmills: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Wolfe, S. & Stanley, J.P. (1980) "Linguistic Problems with Patriarchal Reconstructions of Indo-European Culture: A Little More Than Kin, A Little Less Than Kind" *Women's Studies International Quarterly* Special Issue on *The Voices and Words of Women and Men* vol.3, nos.2-3, pp.227-239.
- Wolpe, A. (1980) "Introduction to Fresh Horizons" *Feminist Review* 6, pp.89-92.
- Wood, E. (1980) "Women in Music" *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture & Society* vol.6, no.2, pp.283-297.
- Woodward, K. (1997) "Concepts of Identity and Difference" in Woodward, K.(ed.) *Identity and Difference* London: Sage Publications.
- Woollacott, A. (1998) "The Fragmentary Subject: Feminist History, Official Records, and Self-Representation" *Women's Studies International Forum* vol.21, no.4, pp.329-339.
- Yee, S. (1998) "Establishing an International Doctoral Program in Women's Studies at the University of Washington" *Feminist Studies* Special Issue on *Disciplining Feminism? The Future of Women's Studies/The Ph.D. in Women's Studies* vol.24, no.2, pp.366-373.
- Yeo, E.J. (ed.) (1998) *Radical Femininity: Women's self-representation in the public sphere* Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Young, P. (ed.) (1993) "Feminist Literary Criticism" in Jackson, S. et al. (eds) *Women's Studies: A Reader* London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1980) "The Bearers of the Collective: Women and Religious Legislation in Israel" *Feminist Review* 4, pp.15-27.
- Zmroczek, C. & Duchon, C. (1991) "What are those Women up to? Women's Studies and Feminist Research in the European Community" in Aaron, J. & Walby, S. (eds) *Out of the Margins: Women's Studies in the Nineties* London: The Falmer Press.